Will There Be An Atomic War?

By S. KESAVAN

People's Publishing House, Ltd., Bombay

Re. 1/-

FIRST PRINTED JANUARY 1949

Printed by Jayant Bhatt at the New Age Printing Press, 190-B, Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4, and published by him for People's Publishing House, Ltd., 190-B, Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4.

CONTENTS

	Introduction	.. 1
I.	The Battle For Control	.. 4
II.	Who Wants War ?	.. 25
III.	Atomic Energy For Peace	.. 51
IV.	Two Camps In The World	.. 60
V.	Where Does India Stand ?	.. 79

INTRODUCTION

DOMINATING the international situation today is the talk of the inevitability of the third world war. The Berlin crisis, the breakdown in the talks of the Atomic Energy Commission, the disputes in Korea or Greece —all have been the occasions for fresh forecasts of the imminence of the outbreak of a third world war.

Occupying a central position in this talk about war is the question of atomic energy, its capacity to destroy, to annihilate the world.

> "The nations can have atomic energy, and much more. But they cannot have it in a world where war may come.
>
> "There is one way to bring about the needed change, for there is a unique solution. The nations must collaborate...The new energy is, if you like, our common enemy; it must be made our common ally."

Such is the conclusion (p.78) of a symposium—*One World or None*, sub-titled *A Report to the Public on the Full Meaning of the Atomic Bomb*—published in March 1946 by the Federation of American (Atomic) Scientists, an organisation embracing more than ninety per cent of the scientists who have worked on atomic energy in the United States. Numbered among them are world-famous figures like Albert Einstein and Niels Bohr—and none can fail to pay attention to the views of these men, each of whom has made his contribution to the development of atomic energy.

The explosion of the atom bomb at Hiroshima faced

the entire world with a new danger—and a new opportunity.

Atomic energy—a million times more powerful than ordinary chemical energy—could blast to the skies the civilian population of Hiroshima; it could also if harnessed to civilian and peaceful use—transform the capacity of man to raise his standard of living, to reach to such heights of prosperity as are unimaginable today.

The whole world is conscious of this; hence the deep desire among millions to see the total prohibition of the use of atomic energy for military purposes, for the destruction of human life, and to see the organisation of a system of effective international control to ensure this prohibition.

This was why the decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations (January 24, 1946) to set up a Commission for the Control of Atomic Energy was welcomed throughout the world. The Commission was charged with the task of preparing and submitting—with the approval of the Security Council—proposals for the elimination of the atomic weapon and all other principal weapons suitable for mass extermination, as well as with preparing proposals for the control of atomic energy on the scale necessary to ensure that atomic energy will be utilised for peaceful purposes only.

This important resolution was reiterated by the UNO General Assembly on December 14, 1946, by which the General Assembly strongly recommended to the Atomic Energy Commission to fulfil within the shortest time its tasks laid down in the resolution of January 24, 1946.

The resolution (of December 1946), while re-emphasising that steps should be taken to ban the atom bomb and establish a system of international control to see that this ban is observed, also laid down that the system of international control should be established within the framework of the Security Council of UNO.

Such was the content of the two historic resolutions of the General Assembly, passed nearly two years ago. Since then the Atomic Energy Commission has

held numerous meetings; proposals have been made and debated; and now its report has been submitted to the recent UNO General Assembly—a report assented to by only a majority of the Commission, led by the United States, Great Britain and France. This report declares that the Commission "had reached an impasse" and that "it was useless to continue its labours until the Soviet Union agrees to cooperate with the world community."

This majority report became the starting-point for an anti-Soviet propaganda campaign of a virulence and intensity unsurpassed even by Hitler: a campaign that reached its height with the last meeting of the UNO General Assembly in Paris.

The Soviet Union has been presented as the one demoniacal Power that rejects international control of atomic energy· a Power that only wants other nations, in particular the USA, to destroy their stocks of atom bombs, while rejecting any international control, any scheme of international inspection that would ensure that she herself does not possess now and will not produce in the future atom bombs—in short a Power that is planning to let loose an atomic war on mankind.

Such has been the theme that has been put across by the entire network of the Anglo-American press.

The Soviet Union is the Power holding up abolition of atomic weapons; the great USA, however, is in favour of international control.

Is this a truthful summing-up of the present international situation? In the Atomic Energy Commission who fought for control, who against? Who is planning atomic war, who is trying to prevent it? What is the real truth and objective of all the propaganda about the atomic bomb being the supreme decisive weapon, that enables its owner to annihilate its enemy? And, finally, in this fast-moving world where does India stand?

These are the questions this booklet aims to answer.

I. THE BATTLE FOR CONTROL

THE TERMS OF reference for the Atomic Energy Commission as laid down in the General Assembly resolution of January 24, 1946 were as follows:

> "A) For extending between all nations the exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful ends;
>
> B) The control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to ensure its use only for peaceful purposes;
>
> C) For the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction;
>
> D) For effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying States against the hazards and violations of evasion."

The terms of reference are clear and categorical—and particularly, as far as the use of atomic energy for military purposes is concerned, they lay down two main points *first*, the prohibition of the atomic weapon; *secondly*, effective international control to ensure that this prohibition is observed. They also state that this organ of international control should work within the framework of the Security Council. And clearly the implementation of *both* these measures alone can ensure real control.

This was why, right at the start came two clear and definitive proposals from the Soviet Union, aimed at implementing the mandate of the General Assembly. On June 19, 1946 its representative, Andrei Gromyko, put forward two proposals.

The first was entitled: "Draft of an International Convention Forbidding the Production and Use of Weapons based on Atomic Energy for the purpose of Mass Destruction."

This Convention declared:

> "The high contracting parties declare that they will forbid the production and use of a weapon based upon the use of atomic energy, and with this end in view take upon themselves the following obligations: a) not to use, in any circumstances, an atomic weapon; b) to forbid the production and keeping of a weapon based upon the use of atomic energy; c) to destroy, within a period of three months from the entry into force of this agreement, all stocks of atomic energy weapons, whether in finished or semi-finished condition."

The second proposal of the Soviet Union was a resolution embodying a plan for the organisation of the work of the Atomic Energy Commission, a plan for the institution of an effective system of international control.

A year later, in the face of no progress in the Commission, the Soviet Union put forward further detailed proposals, supplementing its original proposals regarding international control.

These new proposals formulated the basic principles for an international agreement or convention for the control of atomic energy. In order to ensure that atomic energy was utilised exclusively for peaceful purposes, the Soviet Union proposed the setting up of an International Control Commission, within the framework of the Security Council, which would exercise control over *all* enterprises engaged in the extraction of atomic raw materials or in the production of atomic substances and atomic energy. The control system would operate as follows.

Each government would declare to the Control Commission its establishments (mines, factories, etc.) concerned with the production of atomic energy. These establishments, though owned and operated on a national basis, would be subject to periodical inspection

by the International Commission so that proper care was taken to ensure that no atomic materials were being diverted illegally for the manufacture of atomic weapons

Further, every country would be obliged to provide facilities for investigation by the Control Commission if there was evidence of underhand illicit production of atomic materials in "unofficial" (i.e., undeclared) plants and if the Control Commission decided that a *prima facie* case of such illegal activities had been made out.

In addition, the Soviet proposals also covered items A and B of the terms of reference (laid down in the resolution of January 24, 1946), outlining the basic *principles governing atomic research, directing it to* the development of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, for human progress and prosperity.

These Soviet proposals categorically put the issues in front of the Commission. And in numerous statements, the Soviet delegate, Gromyko, explained that what the Soviet Union meant by "control" was a very serious and comprehensive scheme for effective inspec*tion of all plants concerned with the production of* atomic energy. This stand of the Soviet Union has been summed up by the authoritative Soviet weekly, *New Times*:

> "Control and inspection (must) be established," it wrote on August 20, 1947, "over all enterprises, beginning with mines and ending with plants producing the final matter. ..it should be perfectly obvious that international control over atomic energy loses all its value if it does not provide for concrete measures of control and inspection of all factories involved."

So also Andrei Vyshinsky, Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, replying to the accusation that the USSR does not want control, declared on October 1, 1948:

> "Of course, a convention on the prohibition of the atomic weapon alone, taken by itself, cannot settle the entire issue, for it is necessary to institute

—as Generalissimo Stalin said — strict effective international control in order that this convention for prohibiting the atomic weapon should not remain only on paper."

And to meet the objection that the Soviet Union wants prohibition of atom bomb first and control only later because the USSR has no atomic bombs itself, Vyshinsky at the recent UNO session at Paris brought forward an amended Soviet proposal that the two conventions, one for prohibiting atom bombs and destroying existing stocks and the other for effective international control, should come into force *simultaneously*.

These clear and definitive proposals and statements give the lie direct to the Anglo-American slanders that the USSR is against control of atomic energy. On the contrary, the most concrete and clear plan for such a control has come from the Soviet Union.

It is important to note, however, the original starting-point of the Soviet proposals — the abolition and destruction of the present stocks of atomic and other weapons for mass destruction.

So obviously correct is this starting-point that even the British delegation to the Atomic Energy Commission accepted, on July 7, 1947, the thesis that all existing atomic weapons be destroyed and the nuclear fuel they contained used for peaceful purposes. Later, however, in response to American pressure—for the Americans from the start opposed this proposal — it changed its position and lined up behind the Americans.

But the fact remains that such a proposal coincides with the interests of all nations. Who does not want to see the atomic weapon destroyed—a weapon that is of use *only* for the mass destruction of the civilian population, a weapon that is essentially *not* a weapon directed against the armed forces of the opponent, but one of aggression against the unarmed civilians.

Twenty-three years ago, for the same reason and in response to the pressure of international public opinion, thirty-three States, among them Britain and the United States, agreed by the Geneva Protocol (June 17, 1925) to prohibit the use of methods of bacterio-

logical warfare and the use of poison gas for war, on grounds that these were essentially directed against the civilian population.

If such a convention could be signed twenty-three years ago at Geneva—then why cannot a convention outlawing the atom bomb, a thousand times more deadly than the worst type of poison gas or bacteriological warfare, and even more directly aimed at destroying the lives of unarmed civilians, as at Hiroshima, be adopted today by fifty-five nations at Paris?

There is no argument to meet this—no argument except the fact that the United States of America wishes to retain the atom bomb for use against unarmed civilians, believing that the atom bomb will win for it victory in the next war.

There is no argument except the argument of Winston Churchill, the most shameless propagandist for a third atomic world war, who said recently:

> "Nothing stands between Europe today and complete subjugation to Communist tyranny but the atom bomb in American possession." (Speech at Llandudno, October 1948.)

Can anyone imagine the representative of any country getting up at the Geneva Conference of 1925 in order to object to the proposed convention, outlawing bacteriological warfare on the ground that its possession of the bacteriological weapon, of its capacity to spread millions of plague germs throughout the country of its enemy, was its one great safeguard? Yet such is the argument of Winston Churchill and his American paymasters—for, let me repeat, the atomic weapon *is a far more dangerous and more destructive aggressive weapon for use against the civilian population than any kind of bacteriological warfare.*

This is why the Soviet proposal for a convention for immediate destruction of atom bombs has met with a warm response from many democrats. Typical is the comment, contained in the Memorandum of the British Association of Scientific Workers of August 1948, which states:

> "Such a convention appears to us to be highly desirable and it is difficult to justify the reluctance of the United Kingdom and the United States of America to agree to it."

So also the famous French scientist, Frederic Joliot-Curie, then representing France on the UNO Commission, said on July 5, 1946 that his delegation was of the opinion that one of the first stages in the control plan must be the discontinuation of the production of the atomic weapon.

And it was at this time—a time when the British and French satellites of the dollar had not become the permanently loyal echoes of the American representative—that the US spokesman, cornered by the growing demand for abolition of the atomic weapon, put forward the strange argument:

> "A convention exclusively to outlaw atom bombs would be a source of irritation and would cause an intensification of mutual suspicions"

Could anything be more revealing of the real intentions of the Americans than the absurdity and illogicality of this argument? We are told—quite seriously, quite calmly—that if the United States stopped making atom bombs, it would "intensify mutual suspicions"! Thus, one is to presume that the Americans believe that the best contribution to lessen "mutual suspicions," to eliminate "a source of irritation" is to produce more and more atom bombs!

But driven into a corner, any argument is better than no argument. Moreover, how could the US delegate speak the truth, the naked Churchillian truth, that atom bombs cannot be destroyed because the rulers of America believe that atom bombs are going to win the next war that they are planing? Yet such is the real truth.

Is it surprising then that R. Innes, General Secretary of the Association of Scientific Workers (from whose 1947 Memorandum I have just quoted), should have recently once more raised the question (in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian*):

"What harm would have been done by our agreeing to a declaration that we would not use atomic energy for military purposes in any future war?"

On this occasion, however, he does not (as did the Memorandum I have quoted earlier) leave the question unanswered. On the contrary, he gives a clear reply, declaring:

"In the two years that have elapsed since the first Soviet suggestion for a convention was made it has become clear that the real reason for the attitude of the Western Powers on this issue was that the United States Government deemed it necessary to retain the threat of the use of atomic weapons as a key factor in the cold war against Russia."

Such, therefore, is the true meaning of the dispute over the adoption of a convention regarding the outlawing of the atomic weapon. And does it not show clearly which is the Power working for atomic war and which is the Power working for peace?

The main American argument, however, is that it is *control*, control of atomic energy, that is essential and the Soviet scheme of control is impracticable and unrealistic! They have, therefore, put forward their own scheme of control, originally proposed on their behalf by Bernard Baruch and hence called the Baruch Plan.

Under the Baruch Plan (later in all its essentials approved by the subservient American-led majority of the UNO Atomic Energy Commission) an international body known as the Atomic Development Authority (ADA) is to be set up.

This ADA—it is stated in Clause I—

"should set up a thorough plan for control of the field of atomic energy, through various forms of ownership, dominion, licences, operation, inspection, research and management by competent personnel."

The second clause, dealing with raw materials, states that ADA should obtain complete and accurate information on world supplies of uranium and thorium, bring them under its dominion and conduct continuous surveys, so as to have the most complete knowledge of deposits of uranium and thorium in all countries. Only after all this "can equitable plans be made for their production, refining and distribution."

Thirdly, ADA should—

> "exercise complete managerial control of the production of fissionable materials. This means that it should control and operate all plants producing fissionable materials in dangerous quantities and must own and control the product of these plants."

Thus the first three clauses set up what is virtually a world atomic monopoly trust, that will control the world's supplies of thorium and uranium, own all the factories using atomic energy and *also* that will have "the sole and exclusive right to conduct research in the field of atomic explosives" (Clause 4).

Thus this international body, supposedly meant to stop all production of atom bombs by any nation, will, in fact, own all factories producing atomic energy and will produce atomic explosives also—for what is the use of such research if not to put it into practice? A mighty super-atomic trust, with overwhelming power concentrated in its hands—such is the American plan of "control."

And what is behind this plan becomes very clear when we see that Baruch, dilating on the most essential stipulation of the plan, stated that ADA must not be governed by the principle of unanimity of the Great Powers but by the principle of simple majority.

Professor P. M. S. Blackett, the noted British scientist, winner of the Nobel Prize for Physics and one-time member of the British Government's Advisory Commission on Atomic Energy, in his recent book *Political and Military Consequences of Atomic Energy*, states the real objective and effect of this repudiation of the principle of unanimity thus:

"....it is clear that any reasonable guess at the probable national members of ADA over the next ten or twenty years would give a majority of members voting in favour of such a course (of *slowing down production in the USSR—Writer*) if the United States considered the matter to be of great importance." (Page 137)

Thus at one stroke *ADA is transformed into a body* which will be ruled by the USA—the Power that today controls the majority of the votes in the UNO General Assembly through its many satellites: through the Latin American votes, through the votes of Greece, Turkey, China, of the Western Union and the 16 vassals of the Marshall Plan.

The Baruch Plan also provides for the application of sanctions by ADA against any country refusing to obey ADA; such action can be taken by ADA, independent of the Security Council, and, therefore, will not be governed by the principle of unanimity of the Great Powers.

Thus it becomes a body above and independent of the Security Council, a body *in whose name* the US through its control of ADA, can launch an atomic war.

This point is soberly made by the British Council of Atomic Scientists Association (which includes leading scientists like Oliphant and Moon) which writes in its Memorandum of January 1947:

> "As long as the UNO Charter provides for the right of veto in certain decisions of the Security Council, we do not see how the application of sanctions in matters which concern ADA can be made independent of this right."

In essence, therefore, the Baruch Plan sets up an American-dominated atomic trust, vested with powers of ownership and control of atomic energy all over the world and vested also with the power of making *war*, atomic war, on any State—all, of course, in an "international" garb.

Is this not a parody of internationalism, a hoax on the peoples? In truth, the Baruch Plan has nothing to

do with internationalism, with international control. It is only a plan to invest the present stock-pilers of atom bombs, the USA, with the right to become the Atom Kings of the world.

At the same time, the plan also gives the Americans the opportunity to interfere in the economic life of any nation in any way they wish.

The statement issued by the Executive Committee of the British Association of Scientific Workers in August 1947 put this very clearly, when it declared:

> "The economic power that ownership or control of atomic energy plants will confer could enable economic pressure to be exerted for the purpose of forcing a change in the economic structure of whole nations.... We believe that the location and building of atomic energy plants for industrial purposes should be left to the direction of the nations themselves Nations with limited fuel resources will naturally wish to make greater use of atomic energy industrially than those with ample fuel resources...."

So also the British Council of Atomic Scientists Association has emphasised in its Memorandum that transfer to an international control body of the means of production—

> "into its full ownership, in the usual sense of this word, would give rise to difficulties, since this ownership would give the control body the right to decide whether this or that country is entitled to construct atomic energy plants and the right to prevent the use of energy manufactured by such plants and to set the terms for supplying such energy."

The British atomic scientists then conclude that—

> "such a restriction would make it possible to intervene in the economic life of each country to an extent not necessary for preventing the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes."

Again Professor Blackett, in his book *Political and Military Consequences of Atomic Energy* writes:

> "....a country such as the USSR which attempted to develop atomic energy for power production—even with the most peaceful of intentions, but against a majority decision of ADA—might find itself convicted of the crime of 'wilful interference with the activities of the authority' and so become liable to have instant and condign punishment imposed on her. The Baruch Plan could in fact have transformed a programme of social betterment into an international crime." (Pp. 138-139)

The real intention of this part of the Baruch Plan was revealed in a despatch of Manning, correspondent of the American news-service *United Press,* who in February 1947 commented that the adoption of the Baruch Plan for a "strong" atomic energy authority, without the principle of Great Power unanimity—

> "could retard or prevent entirely the development of atomic power or its beneficent utilisation within Russia or in the countries friendly to the Soviet Union."

Manning, it appears, is somewhat startled by the bare-faced nature of American claims and draws back in fear. But not so Mr. Virgil Jordan, President of the US National Industrial Conference Board, one of the key organisations that unite and speak for America's Big Business.

Speaking in March 1947, this modest gentleman advanced the claim that the US should police the whole world and demand—

> "the unlimited right of continuous inspection and control of every industrial operation and process and every public policy which may have the most remote relationship to armament and warfare." (Speech at a meeting of the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.)

And it will surprise no one to learn that Mr. Jordan, after making this declaration, followed it up with the further demand that the US should make more and

better atom bombs so as to be able at will to drop them on any country in the entire world.

Such is the real face of the Baruch Plan, as expressed in the unrestrained language and appetites of one of the kings of Wall Street.

These are not the only objections to the Baruch Plan, though by themselves they are enough to make any honest man reject it. For, who would agree to a system of international control of atomic energy which has nothing to do with international control but everything to do with undivided American control and American domination?

But even this scheme to set up an ADA, this fake international control, is one that will not come into operation immediately, in a short time or even in any foreseeable future.

For the American plan is discreetly described as a plan of control "by stages."

During the first stage—at the outset—control will be established only over the sources of the raw materials necessary for production of atomic energy.

After ownership of all these sources of raw materials throughout the world has been handed over to ADA, then only the second stage will come into operation which requires the transfer of ownership of the factories involved in the intermediary processes, the extraction of the key material from uranium or thorium and the production of nuclear fuel, etc; finally, after all these factories have been swallowed up by ADA, the ownership of the factories actually producing the atomic weapons will be transferred to ADA.

Thus, in the first two stages, the US factories today producing atom bombs will go ahead full blast, while the US-dominated ADA is getting its grasping hands first on every source of atomic raw materials and then on all factories involved in intermediary processes and producing nuclear fuel, on all research laboratories, etc. During all this time the stock-pile of atom bombs in the USA will be steadily mounting.

The British Council of Atomic Scientists Association in its statement of January 1947 criticised the American plan for this aspect, declaring:

"The most important objection from the point of view of other nations is probably that it envisages in its first stages measures which may be construed as maintaining the dominance of the United States in the field of atomic energy, whereas the concessions which are to be made by that country appear mostly in the later stages. If these later stages are not to be ratified until the previous ones have been achieved, technically Congress could withhold ratification at any stage."

In fact, it is this provision more than anything else that reveals the real face of the Baruch Plan. It is essentially not a plan for immediate control or even immediate international ownership by ADA of all atomic energy processes. Even this would be too risky a venture for the American monopolists. Therefore, we are served up with this theory of control by stages. This will enable the US monopolists to test out the plan properly in the earlier stages when they have not yet surrendered anything at all to ADA and then only, when they feel thoroughly confident that ADA is satisfactorily and totally under their domination, will they set about placing their atom-bomb producing factories at ADA's disposal. If at any stage they are not satisfied, they—through Congress—will just withhold ratification and refuse to hand over their atomi-bomb factories to ADA.

And this testing-out time—for that is really what the time set apart for the preliminary stages amounts to—how long will it take? One is entitled to ask: How long will it be before we arrive at the stage when the ownership of factories producing these foul inhuman weapons is transferred to ADA?

The minutes of the discussion in the Atomic Energy Commission give no answer to this most important question. On the contrary, to the repeated enquiries of the Soviet representative, Andrei Gromyko, to his repeated insistence that the Atomic Energy Commission fix a time-limit by which all these stages will be finished, the American-dominated majority in the Commission refused to give a straight answer.

Does this not show that the Americans are not even serious about implementing the Baruch Plan, that they only want, as it were, to set the Plan going, to grab all sources of atomic raw materials, to poke their noses into every country on the plea of investigating for such raw materials and to prolong this process as long as possible so that, on the one hand, they steadily establish a stranglehold on the world's sources of atomic raw materials and on all factories etc., while, on the other, they freely push forward to build up their stockpile of atom bombs?

Professor Blackett also points out how the Baruch Plan gives every advantage to the Americans and disadvantage to the Soviet Union:

> "Since (under the Plan) America would keep her atomic bombs till late stage.... the Soviet Union could have no firm guarantee that when the stage was reached at which the bombs should be disposed of, some technical point would not be raised to justify retaining them. In the meantime, she would have thrown her land and economy open to inspection and so inevitably to military espionage." (*Political and Military Consequences of Atomic Energy*, p. 144.)

That this is so is shown by another peculiar feature of the American plan. According to this plan, during its first and second stages (i.e., before the final third stage when the factories producing atom bombs will be handed over to ADA), an aerial survey will be made of the territories of all countries subject to control, for the ostensible purpose of determining the location of atomic energy plants, mines, etc. This survey, obviously a herculean task, will cover, according to the American calculations, five per cent of the territory of each country every two years. Thus, by this method it will take *forty years in all* to complete the survey.

Since, according to the American plan, the third stage cannot be reached until this survey is completed and as the survey is an essential pre-condition to effective control, we are asked to agree that for at least forty years the present US atom-bomb factories will

continue to turn out atom bombs. And this is what the Americans call international control!

In truth, this aerial survey has nothing to do with international system of control but everything to do with American plans for world domination. The Executive Committee of the Association of Scientific Workers, commenting on the proposal for inspection in the *American plan (apart from the aerial survey), stated:*

> "Against the possession of the atomic bomb by one country, the most effective defence in the hands of the USSR lies in the fact that the disposition of its industry is largely unknown to other Powers. This effective defence would be destroyed if United Nations inspectors were given roving commissions to go anywhere...."

Professor Blackett also, in the book mentioned above, sharply nails down the real objective of the American proposal for inspection, declaring:

> "The operation of such an unlimited survey in the USSR would have given the UNO inspectors—and hence the American Chiefs of Staff—a fairly complete target map of the USSR, even if it did not develop into a complete system of military and industrial espionage." (Page 139)

In fact, both, the American system of inspectors and the proposed aerial survey, are directed to fill in this unfortunate gap in the knowledge of the American warmongers.

For instance, on May 30, 1948, the most respectable and reliable spokesman of the American monopolies, the *New York Times Magazine,* carried an article expressing regret that the United States virtually did not possess satisfactory maps of most of the regions in Russian territory.

> "This," the article said, "is perhaps the greatest disadvantage the offence would suffer in bombing attacks upon Russia. For 'blind' bombing the most exact type of map is essential."

Evidently the American representatives on the Atomic Energy Commission are seeking to make up for this "greatest disadvantage" by their proposal of an aerial survey.

Is it surprising that the Soviet Union opposed and continues to oppose this vicious plan, this plan of the atom warmongers to become the atom monarchs of the world?

The majority American-sponsored report of the Atomic Energy Commission sweetly informs us that the American plan "strikes a blow at the prerogatives and sovereignty of individual States." But it argues that there is no other way out: either voluntarily relinquish some of your sovereignty or face an atomic war—such is the dilemma facing the nations of the world.

And the Americans, posing as sponsors of world ownership, as Socialists as it were, even hypocritically propagandise:

> "It has been noted as something of a paradox that the Soviet Union, a Communist State, should object to communal ownership, whereas other nations, known as leaders in private enterprise, should endorse it." (From the State Department publication, *International Control of Atomic Energy—Policy at the Crossroads.*)

One can only gasp at the utter shamelessness of this argument, at this attempt to pass off unlimited domination by the American monopolies as "international ownership."

In their more private moments, the American monopolists do not scruple to hide the real meaning of their scheme of "international ownership." There is the example of Mr. Thomas, Vice-President of the Monsanto Chemical Trust and closely connected with atom-bomb production in the USA, who testifying before the American Senate Commission, declared:

> "According to our project, we (note the possessive "we"—*Writer*) get all the Russian uranium at the disposal of the international organisation. In

other words, all the radio-active materials of the whole world will be under the charge of the organisation, and above all we (again!) shall have in Russia a group of geologists prospecting throughout its territory and collecting information regarding the existence of uranium."

In fact, to all these American arguments about international ownership, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister, Andrei Vyshinsky, gave a fitting reply.

> "We are prepared to relinquish part of our sovereignty for the sake of this supreme welfare, but it has to be *our common supreme welfare*.
>
> But where is it? It has to be a welfare based on mutual respect, on mutual confidence, on cooperation. And where is it?....
>
> And here now they bring us, in the same pious and unctuous expressions, that very same plan of international control, which aims at subordinating to their control the national economy of a sovereign country. Atomic energy and raw materials are not enough—give us a systematic, annually repeated photograph of your territory, that's what this 'international body' demands....
>
> No, gentlemen, we will not agree to such a plan, for it lacks the elementary conditions and foundations which are called conscientious international cooperation. We say that concealed behind high-faluting words.... is the true aim of the American plan—to give the United States of America the unrestricted right to interfere in the economic life of any country under cover of the decision of the majority in the control body." (October 1, 1948.)

In truth, the American plan is a specious proposal designed to avoid any international control and to wreck the work of the UNO Atomic Energy Commission, in order to allow the USA to go freely with its research into and production of atomic weapons and atom bombs.

Professor Blackett also sees in the American plan for control an attempt to avoid any control.

> "There always has been a large group (in the USA) which never wanted any international control ....Once, however, the United Nations had adopted the principle of international control, the obvious tactics of this group were to demand a form of control which was so one-sided as to be clearly unacceptable to the Soviet Union. Thus some of the support for the Baruch Plan may have had its origin in an attempt to block any kind of control at all." (*Ibid*, p. 142)

This is revealed in the statements of many leading American statesmen, of which I give only a few here. Take, for instance, that very authoritative gentleman, David E. Lilienthal, who enjoys a certain reputation as a liberal in our country because he once headed the TVA.

Lilienthal was the head of the civilian United States Atomic Committee, and in the book *International Control Over Atomic Energy of the USA* he is quoted as stating:

> "Our security depends in part on the secrecy of certain vital information and on the knowledge of the methods of production which we alone possess. *For we wish to prolong the monopoly of this knowledge as long as possible*, realising full well that it at best will be temporary."

Is it not clear that men like Lilienthal will strive to postpone as long and as far as possible the day when international control is instituted?

Or take Thomas Dewey, defeated Republican Presidential candidate, who in a speech, delivered at Phoenix in September this year, shamelessly declared:

> "Our (i.e., of Dewey and his supporters—*Writer*) thoughts about atomic energy are concentrated primarily *on its utilisation* for war purposes."

Or take Senator McKeller of Tennesse (in passing, it might be noted that this rabid reactionary, despite Lilienthal's open avowal of support for US monopolists' atomic policy, called Lilienthal a "Moscow Agent") who is the bluntest of all. In one of his speeches in Congress when the appointment of members of the Atomic Energy Commission were discussed, McKeller is reported to have exclaimed dramatically:

> "I pray God we will never have an international agreement to control atomic energy."

But, of course, if the American monopolies are forced to agree to some form of international control, then as far as they are concerned it may be international in name, but its content must be American. An interesting admission of this fact was made by the American journalist Robert de Vore, writing in the well-known magazine *Colliers'*, on May 3, 1947:

> "The same fears that moved Congress in writing atomic law for America moved American diplomats at Lake Success as they tried to write it for the world. And the pattern for control which they sought was almost identical. Instead of a domestic Atomic Energy Commission, they wanted an International Atomic Development Authority. The men who made up this Authority would have powers very similar to those entrusted to the US Commission."

Thus, ADA—like the US Commission—would not be charged with the duty of international control, nor with the utilisation of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. On the contrary, under American aegis, it would go forward towards developing—in Dewey's succinct words—"its utilisation for war purpose."

Such, therefore, are the facts about the respective stands of the Soviet Union and the United States on the question of international control of atomic energy.

On the one hand, from the Soviet Union has come a clear and practical scheme for the immediate outlawing of the atom bomb and the institution of an

effective system of strict international control. On the other, from the United States has come a scheme which is only a plan to establish domination of the world by the US monopolies, a plan for atomic war and a plan which, even if implemented, will allow the USA to continue producing atom bombs for forty years.

Who is for control, who against?

Who is for peace, who against?

Is it not clear as daylight that it is the American atom-mongers who, drunk with their feeling of power, are driving the world to a third atomic world war?

Is it not equally clear that it is the Soviet Union, sentinel and guardian of peace, that is leading the battle, the just and noble battle, against these wreckers of the world, these would-be murderers of hundreds of millions of innocent unarmed people?

The facts outlined above give a single unassailable answer to this question, directly contradicting the lying imperialist propaganda that has been spread throughout the world that the Americans are for control, while the Soviet Union is against it.

In fact, the essence of the American "plan" for control of atomic energy, which we have seen to be no plan for control but a plan for world domination, was that it was a double-faced manoeuvre—directed, on the one hand, to prevent any agreement on international control and, on the other, to be able to paint a picture of the Soviet Union as wanting war and objecting to control.

Professor Blackett, in his book, soberly sums up this latter aspect of the American plan.

> "On balance, the Baruch plan must be considered as an astute move and a very considerable victory for American diplomacy. For so great was the success with which this *specious* plan was put across in most countries as a wise and generous measure, that it became possible to brand the Soviet Union, by her rejection of it, as the sole obstacle to world peace." (Pp. 143-144—*emphasis writer's.)*

But whatever be the initial confusion caused by the blaring of this big American lie by the capitalist press throughout the world, ultimately it is the truth that will triumph—and increasingly so as the peoples of the world see and feel in practice the real nature of Wall Street's policy of expansionism and war.

II. WHO WANTS WAR?

THE FUNDAMENTAL REASON that governs the present rulers of the United States in putting forward their fake plan for international control of atomic energy is that their policy is a war policy, aimed at world domination; their every action today is based on the belief that World War III is both necessary and inevitable.

It is necessary because there is no other way of keeping up their profits, of preserving the imperialist system.

It is inevitable because there is no other way of stemming the advance of the common people, headed by the Socialist Soviet Union, towards the abolition of the capitalist system, the system of exploitation of man by man.

For the principal result of World War II was the immense advance of popular forces and the set-back to imperialism.

World War II saw the end of the most reactionary and shamelessly war-mongering imperialists, the Fascists of Germany, Italy and Japan. The imperialists of Britain, France and the United States had hoped that the Fascists would destroy the Soviet Union and the democratic and working-class movements throughout Europe, and thus strengthen the imperialist system.

However, the war did not end as they wished; on the contrary, it was the Fascists who were defeated and the world capitalist system, instead of being strengthened, emerged out of the war far weaker than before.

The Soviet Union was victorious and stronger than ever before; throughout Eastern Europe, the toiling masses, led by the working class, overthrew the old

feudal-capitalist rulers, and took the path of Socialism. In the West, mass Communist Parties and mighty trade unions came forward to play a more and more decisive part in the life of their countries. In the East, led and inspired by the great Chinese People's Liberation Army, the peoples of Asia took the path of armed struggle for independence (Indonesia, Viet Nam, etc.) and the movements for national liberation reached a new level.

Thus World War II saw a great leap forward of the anti-imperialist forces, fighting for independence, democracy and Socialism, and a consequent weakening of the imperialist system as a whole.

But World War II also saw a strengthening of one imperialist Power—American imperialism.

The United States has a population of 130 million, but the real power in the USA rests in the hands of a narrow financial clique—of eight giant capitalist groups, five "family" groups of Morgan, Kuhn Loeb, Rockefeller and Du Pont, and three local groups centred on Chicago, Cleveland and Boston.

The US Senate Small Business Committee Report, *Economic Concentration in World War II,* gives the following revealing figures about their area of control.

	million dollars
Morgan. ..	30,000
Kuhn-Loeb. ..	11,000
Rockefeller. ..	6,500
Chicago group. ..	4,000
Mellon. ..	3,000
Du Pont. ..	2,500
Cleveland group. ..	1,500
Boston group. ..	1,500

It is these groups that control the all-powerful National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), the organisation that speaks for the capitalist class in the United States.

Another Senate report (*Civil Liberties Report,* of 1939, part 45, p. 16783, quoted in George Seldes' book *1,000 Americans*) declares that NAM policy is formed by and campaigned for by 12 billionaire corporations,

ten of which are controlled by one of the giant groups mentioned above These twelve are:

American Telephone and Telegraph Co. (Morgan); General Electric Co. (Morgan); U.S. Steel Corporation (Morgan); E.I. Du Pont de Nemours (Du Pont); General Motors (Du Pont); U.S. Rubber Co (Du Pont); Standard Oil of New Jersey (Rockefeller); Westinghouse Electric (Mellon); Goodyear Tire and Rubber (Cleveland); International Harvester Co. (Chicago); Irving Trust Co.; Bethlehem Steel Co.

It is about these companies that the Senate report quoted above comments that—

> "relatively few giant corporations.... have come to dominate our entire economy....largely owned by a few thousand stock-holders...controlled by a mere handful of huge financial interests."

These "huge financial interests" dominate the United States today. Their nominees stand at the head of both the Republican and Democratic Parties. Their agents in Congress manoeuvre affairs as their masters wish—as, for instance, over the issue of the Taft-Hartley Anti-Labour Bill, finally passed as an Act last year (1947) by Congress after a long-drawn out twelve-year campaign of NAM.

In the debate on this Bill (*Congressional Record*, April 15, 16 and 17, 1947) a dozen members showed that this anti-working-class measure originated, was sponsored and written by NAM representatives. On pp. 3731-3733 in parallel columns, the NAM draft and the actual Bill are given, showing that they were identical.

The Government itself is full of men who come directly from families of Big Business.

W. Averell Harriman, former Commerce Secretary, now ERP Special Representative, in private life is a partner of Brown Brothers, and Harriman Co., New York—big investment bankers. Robert Lovett, General Marshall's first assistant, also hails from Brown Brothers. Paul Hoffman, ERP Administrator, was President of the Studebaker Automobile Corporation. Charles E. Saltzman, another of Marshall's assistants, was

President of the New York Stock Exchange. James Forrestal, Secretary of Defence, was a leading figure in Dillon, Read & Company, another big banking investment firm—and Major General Draper, his Under-Secretary, also hails from the same firm. The right-hand man of General Clay (US Military Governor in American occupied zone of Germany) is Colonel Frederick L. Devereaux, a former official of American Telephone and Telegraph Co.

In fact, this list is a never-ending one — for the entire administration from top to bottom is honeycombed with nominees of American monopoly. President Truman himself is closely connected with a powerful banking group based on the Mid-West, as is Snyder, his Secretary of the Treasury (the Finance Minister), who is a St. Louis Banker.

Such are the real rulers of the United States. And it is these gentlemen who emerged out of World War II greatly strengthened, economically and militarily.

Of the six so-called great capitalist Powers, three (Germany, Italy and Japan) were eliminated during the war, France was forced into the background while Great Britain's position was considerably undermined.

Only the USA emerged stronger, and today like a colossus dominates the capitalist world.

During the war itself the big capitalists greatly enriched themselves and increased their dominant hold on the country's economy

According to the figures published by the US Department of Commerce, the net profits of all US corporations in the period 1940-45, *after* payment of taxes, exceeded 52 billion dollars.

But all these profits were by no means evenly divided between all the capitalists; on the contrary, it was the big fish who grabbed the greatest share, the small fellows got comparatively little.

One hundred corporations received 67.7 per cent of all US war contracts—a total of 173 billion dollars: "of this group one firm alone, General Motors (which is controlled by a combination of Morgan-Du Pont interests), received almost 14 billion dollars, or 8 per cent; and in all less than 4 per cent of all manufacturing

corporations earned more than 84 per cent of all the net profits of all manufacturing companies." (*Report of US Government Smaller War Plants Corporation.*)

This was why the number of firms employing 10,000 workers or more increased from 49 to 344 while simultaneously over two million small and medium firms went out of business.

In the course of the war, also, American industry, fed by the demands of the Allied world, greatly expanded. The index of industrial production (1939=100) rose to 240 in 1944; US share of the production of the capitalist world rose from 43.6 per cent in 1937 to 60 per cent by the end of World War II.

Thus while millions lost their lives, many countries were devastated by Fascist invasion—for the US monopolists, World War II was a boon from heaven. They amassed astronomical profits, strengthened their grip on their country's economy and won a dominating position in the capitalist world.

But with the end of the war, new and difficult problems faced the imperialists of the USA. During the war, at home they had made vast profits; abroad, taking advantage of the disappearance from the market of their principal competitors (Germany, Japan, Italy and also France, under Nazi domination, while Britain was forced into a position of subservience to American monopoly), they established their unquestioned supremacy in all the capitalist markets of the Allied world.

Today, vastly stronger and more powerful, with immense financial resources, the imperialists of Wall Street, if they are to maintain their profits, have only one way of doing it—to retain the markets they won during the war and to drive incessantly to conquer more and more new markets.

This drive for the conquest of foreign markets was made even more urgent because of the shrinking of the home market. With the end of the war the government orders for armaments dropped steeply, at the same time, in its greed for high profits, Big Business also struck hard at wages—and, therefore, the standard of life of the American worker—and in this way the home market also began to shrink.

A few figures will reveal how this process is taking place

Profits—6.5 billion dollars in 1939—rose to 28 billion dollars in 1947—the biggest rise being scored after the removal of price control in November, 1946.

In contrast, real wages dropped 16 to 17 per cent during 1945-1947. The result was—in the words of a capitalist paper, *Commerce*, of Bombay:

> "There are limits to high prices even in the richest country of the world and no doubt can be entertained that a very large percentage of the population has been priced out of the market." (August 7, 1948)

Faced with a shrinking home market—produced by their grab-and-loot capitalist policy of high profits and low wages—the Wall Street imperialists were forced to turn their attention more and more to capture foreign markets. The increased importance of exports in American economy can be understood from a single fact: exports have risen in value from an average of 4.6 billion dollars in 1939 to 20 billion dollars in 1947.

At the same time, as their profits increased, their capital resources also multiplied at a tremendous speed; in 1917 there were six firms with assets over 1,000 million dollars each, by 1942 there were 32 such firms and total assets had jumped from 10,000 million dollars to 67,000 million dollars.

These huge industrial-financial oligarchs, as they amassed enormous capital, naturally exported this capital to colonise and enslave more and more countries, to establish their dominating grip over economies of these countries, to extract super-profits out of the cheaper labour available to them in the colonial or semi-colonial countries, where the wage scales were far lower than in the USA.

Thus in the single year 1946-47 the rate of American investments abroad shot up steeply from 5.2 billion dollars in 1946 to 10 billion dollars in 1947. (London *Economist*, Aug. 2, 1947.) But even this, it is estimated, only covers one-third of the total "surplus" US capi-

tal that is striving to find profitable fields of investment abroad.

It is this that lies behind the openly predatory and expansionist policy that has now been adopted by the Wall Street monopolists.

Imperialism by its very nature cannot live without expansion, without striving for more and more markets for export of its goods and its capital, for bringing more and more countries under its sway.

Today this basic feature of the imperialist system is more true than even before. As a result of World War II, firstly, a considerable area of Europe has gone out of the imperialist orbit as the countries of Eastern Europe have broken away and taken the path of Socialism. Secondly, the devastation during the war has hit all Western Europe very hard and, therefore, lowered its capacity to import goods. Thirdly, the markets in Asia, previously happy-hunting grounds for the imperialist exploiters, are also narrowing down as the national liberation movements grow in strength, take to armed battle and free large sections of their countries (China, Viet Nam, Indonesia and now Burma) from imperialist exploitation.

Hence as a whole, the post-war capitalist world market is considerably smaller than in pre-war days —and, therefore, the struggle for markets, the driving force behind the imperialist policy of expansion, more fierce and intense.

In the post-war world, it is the American imperialists who are driving forward relentlessly with such a policy of expansion. Taking advantage of the post-war economic difficulties of Europe and of their former competitors like Britain, the US imperialists have produced the grandiose deception, called the Marshall Plan, which in the name of financing European "recovery", is in fact bringing all Europe under the sway of the Almighty Dollar.

Popularised as a plan for relief, it is in fact a plan for capturing the markets and enslaving the peoples of Western Europe.

More than anything else Europe needs machinery, machinery to re-equip her devastated industries; but in

the first five months of the Marshall Plan, industrial machinery accounted for 3 per cent of the deliveries under the plan, while agricultural machinery accounted for 0.1 per cent of the deliveries!

In contrast, exports of tobacco, fruit juice, egg powder and such materials amounted to more than the deliveries of industrial and agricultural machinery, steel ingots and rolled steel—all taken together.

The nakedly expansionist character of the plan is shown up more than anything else by the way in which the original proposals of the beggars' conference of the sixteen Marshallised countries in Paris (1947) were hacked about by the US Congress.

The Paris Conference asked for 400 million dollars worth of equipment for the steel industry; these were cut to half by the final ERP allotments.

The Paris Conference figures for crude steel and scrap iron for their steel factories were cut to one-third by the US Congress.

In contrast, the Paris Conference figures for finished steel products of US factories were tripled—i.e., ERP will export three times more finished steel than requested at Paris. What else is this than a crude attempt to restrict the steel industry of Western Europe and capture the steel market for American-produced goods!

This shows clearly enough that the Marshall Plan is transforming Western Europe into a dumping ground for surplus American goods.

In addition, in return for this generosity in dried eggs and fruit juice, the Wall Street imperialists, through their Marshall Plan representatives, have established a firm hold on the economies of every one of these countries in Western Europe; they have imposed such conditions that no trade in any goods asked for under the Marshall Plan can be undertaken except with their express permission, and all raw materials needed for US "security" must be willingly given up by countries of the West.

For instance, the Canadian paper *The Globe and Mail* (of Toronto) made this point very clear, when it wrote:

> "Provisions of ERP stipulate that surplus US agricultural produce must be used for shipments to Europe before 'off-shore' purchases are made." (August 30, 1948.)

This only means that till all US surplus produce has been disposed of in the ERP countries, they will not be permitted to buy from any other country.

Again, under ERP, virtual dollar control of the currency of every country of Western Europe is to be achieved. According to President Truman, each recipient of American 'generosity' will be asked to—

> "deposit in a special account the local currency equivalent of aid furnished in the form of grants to be used only in a manner mutually agreed between the two Governments."

This can only lead to the accumulation in American hands of vast blocks of local currency, for use in any way that Wall Street wishes. Principally this will be used to buy up local stocks and shares in industries and banks, and thus gain direct ownership of European industries, reducing all countries of Western Europe to the status of colonies in every sense of the term.

That this is the real aim of the American imperialists was revealed by Lewis H. Morgan, Chairman of the Johns-Manville Corporation (a Morgan concern), one of Wall Street's top policy-makers.

> "We can take payment (for the Marshall Plan)," he demanded in a speech to a convention of oil corporations in Chicago, "in ownership of European industry. For instance, American private investors could buy stock in, or bonds of, European industries." (November 13, 1947.)

That one of the principal objectives of the Marshall Plan is to take over the ownership of major industries in Europe is further revealed when we consider the position of the oil industry.

ERP allows for one-and-a-half billion dollars worth of Marshall Plan exports of oil-refining equipment (incidentally, this is three times the amount

asked for by the Paris Conference) to supply American-owned oil-refineries in Europe; in addition, it guarantees American oil investments in Europe to the tune of 850 million dollars in 14 years.

Thus the Marshall Plan takes care of all the needs of Wall Street, finding markets both for its export of goods and of capital.

The result of all this is not the promised and much-boosted "recovery" but the pauperisation of the people of these countries and their growing indebtedness to Wall Street—while Wall Street's partners in crime, the local capitalists, grow richer like their patrons. For instance, the French workers' standard of life has dropped from 79 per cent of pre-war in August 1946 to 51 per cent of pre-war in October 1948; many French industries have closed down, while the share of the capitalists (local and foreign) in the French national income has risen from 29 per cent in 1938 to 42.5 per cent in 1948.

Of vital importance also is the central position allotted by American imperialism to Western Germany. Under the Marshall Plan, the *total* amount of "relief" to be sent to Western Germany is more than to any other country in Western Europe.

Here is the allocation of funds under the actual plan:

Britain	....	$ 5,348,000,000
France	....	$ 3,701,000,000
Italy	....	$ 2,913,000,000
W. Germany (Bizonia)	....	$ 2,499,000,000, etc.

But these figures do not take into account the expenditure by the War Department in running Bizonia—which, according to official estimates, runs to a sum of some four billion dollars for the four-year period of the Marshall Plan.

Thus the total outlay by the US Government for Western Germany would be round about 6½ billion dollars—more than for any single other country.

These 6½ million dollars, however, are not to be directed to the "recovery," i.e., prosperity, of Western Germany; they are to finance the new unholy alliance

of the German industrial barons and Wall Street monopolists that is taking shape today.

In 1947, Lewis H. Brown, Chairman of the Johns-Manville Corporation (a Morgan concern), visited Germany on the express invitation of General Clay, US Military Governor. He prepared a report for the War Department, that was later published as a book, entitled *A Report on Germany*, acquiring the status practically of an official directive.

Brown's book gives the blue-prints of America's plans not only for Germany but for the domination of Europe He says clearly that there must be no nonsense about eliminating the men who financed and backed the Nazis, the barons of industry.

> "The industrial leaders", writes Brown. "who have spent their lives coming up in the industrial machine, are the only ones that know how to make it work... Practically everyone with brains in Germany served the Nazi programme and the German war-effort in some capacity. One cannot run a war economy without brains. The Nazis learned that early. Likewise, *one cannot run a peacetime economy without brains*. It is time we learned that."

Thus, Brown recommends that a new alliance with these "brains" of Germany must be forged in order to "permit her to perform her essential economic functions as the industrial heart of Western Europe."

For this purpose, he says, American-German trade and business relations must be speedily re-established, and recommends:

> "Contracts of German firms with firms of foreign countries (i.e., USA) to utilise the latter's sales agencies and facilities as a means of getting products flowing quickly.
>
> Partnerships of industrial companies from other (again—USA, obviously) countries with German firms in order to help to supply capital; distribution facilities abroad and raw materials necessary to the revival of German industry."

What else is this but a plan for the joint exploitation of Western Germany by American and German Big Business? And it is clear that the latest decision of the Anglo-American alliance—to hand back the industries to men whom they call "German trustees" but who in fact are the old Nazi industrialists—is only a part of this plan to utilise Western Germany as Wall Street's base from which to dominate Western Europe.

In fact, the core of the Marshall Plan is the project for restoring Western Germany. Not long ago, the *New York Times* made this very plain, writing:

> "If Bizonia did not get what it wanted, the US Congress could not be expected to continue appropriating funds for European recovery." (September 12, 1948)

The British *News Chronicle* commented recently that under the four-year plan for Bizonia, exports from West Germany are to reach a level 60 per cent higher than before the war.

But, here again, this has nothing to do with the conditions of the people of Western Germany; the American monopolists and their junior partners in Germany will garner big profits and conquer Europe's markets—but the German people will go down the road of poverty Already this has become clear.

In July 1948, 100 D (Bizonia) marks were valued at 75 Swiss francs, by October they were worth only 22 Swiss francs and by the beginning of November, 10 to 15 francs. Prices have gone up some three times since the Marshall Plan started its operation. Today the German people, reduced to colonial slavery, live in such conditions that the paper *Die Wett* wrote recently:

> "The shopper must consider what he will do without, fresh vegetable, fat, meat and fish or rent. It is possible to purchase clothing, underwear and footwear but only at the cost of cutting down on food"

Such, therefore, is the perspective before every one of the Marshallised countries of Western Europe,

their growing subordination to American imperialism, *their transformation into colonies of US monopoly.*

Even the imperialists now admit that ERP will lead to no real recovery—in the sense of improvement of people's conditions.

Sir Stafford Cripps, chief British salesman of ERP, admitted as much, saying:

> "We don't contemplate any marked improvement in the standard of living of Britain during the European Recovery Programme." (Speech in Ottawa, September 1948.)

So also the organ of the industrial-financial oligarchs of the USA, the *New York Times*, wrote on September 29, 1948:

> "In most of the ERP countries it will not be possible to raise existing living standards to any marked degree for a number of years"

And why?

> "Because," answers the *New York Times*, "the United States Congress next spring may be more interested in arming Europe than in restoring its peace-time prosperity."

Here is the cat out of the bag—with a vengeance. For what else does this mean but that the aim of the Marshall Plan is not to organise European recovery but to organise European war?

For such is the real meaning and aim of the Marshall Plan—to destroy the independence of the countries of Western Europe, *to transform them into colonial satellites* and ultimately into military bases for war.

The Marshall Plan is not a plan for recovery, but a plan for war.

The same expansionist policy in Asia takes a different form; for here the imperialist structure is menaced by the entire peoples in armed revolt. In Viet Nam, Indonesia, Malaya, Burma and above all in China, the peoples are attacking the imperialist order and resolutely battling for their freedom.

In this situation the American imperialists come

forward as principal supporter of the colonial wars that are today going on throughout Asia. Behind the French in Indo-China, the British in Malaya, the Dutch in Indonesia, behind Chiang Kai-shek's rotten feudal regime in China stand the dollars and guns of American imperialism.

Thus in every colonial country, it is Wall Street's support that is upholding the old order, utilising for this purpose the reactionary classes in the colonies themselves, who, like Chiang, are ready to barter away the sovereignty of their country in return for foreign "aid", because without this support the national liberation movements would sweep them out of existence.

This is why throughout Asia it is Wall Street which has come forward as the saviour of the imperialist order—buttressing and inspiring armed warfare in its defence—while, at the same time, taking over the chief imperialist economic positions in Asia more and more from the older imperialist Powers.

But the ambitions of the American monopolists do not end here; direct penetration and conquest of the countries of the capitalist world alone cannot satisfy the needs of Wall Street It is already obvious that the Marshall Plan is no solution of the US monopolists' problem—the ever-pressing problem of increasing their export markets and thus keeping high their level of production and profits.

For, despite the Marshall Plan, American exports have gone down in the past year. Here are the figures:

May 1947	1,503	million dollars
March 1948 (Marshall Plan begins)	1,141	" "
April	1,123	" "
May	1,108	" "
June	1,013	" "
July	1,022	" "
August	988	" "
September	926	" "

The declining trend continues; shipments from America to foreign countries fell by 62 million dollars in September 1948 — the lowest figure since October

1946. The US balance of trade was reduced to 389 8 million dollars—again the lowest for two years. (*Commerce*, Bombay, October 6.)

The *Washington correspondent of Commerce* then comments that "there is now a surplus of output in the US because of the diminishing exports, which is being viewed with alarm by the industry."

All in all, it is expected that the drop in exports in 1948 as compared to 1947 will be over 14 per cent.

In fact, this drive for export markets in Europe *and Asia cannot satisfy the limitless appetites of the* American monopolies; this is particularly so because the US wants to export—but not import anything in return; at the same time, all over Western Europe the devastated countries which also retain the capitalist economic system and, therefore, are driven by the same motive force—the hunt for profits—also wish to increase *exports and diminish their imports.*

An outstanding example is Britain; forced to swallow an indigestible amount of American goods, it is striving to compensate by virtually cutting out all imports from other countries, while simultaneously attempting to expand its own exports. Thus the extraordinary position has arisen by which Britain plans *to export £100 million worth of machinery to* Western Europe, but is prepared to import only £7 million worth of their goods!

Such is the vicious circle in which the imperialists have landed themselves, a reflection of the depth of the crisis of the imperialist system as a whole. The general law of capitalism is in operation in its most ruthless manner. Like animals in a jungle, each capitalist country ravages forth throughout the world in an effort to win markets for its goods. And in this jungle, it is the American lion with its enormous power that is squeezing out all others.

But despite the fact that in the capitalist jungle the American imperialism is the unchallenged king, the jungle is not big enough to satisfy its demands, and the Wall Street monopolies turn their hungry eyes on the vast territories of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Here are the new markets, here is the promised

Eldorado of a vast colonial empire—which Hitler also once dreamt of conquering.

This empire, however, is not there for the asking. Strong governments, headed by the working class and led by the Soviet Union, have given a firm unyielding rebuff to all American plans (like the Marshall Plan) directed to enslave their countries. And baulked by the resolute determination of these countries to defend their independence and not to allow themselves to be transformed into America's colonies, the Wall Street monopolies have determined to annihilate them by war.

This is all the more so because in contrast to the growing economic crisis and poverty of the Marshallised countries of Western Europe, the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are forging ahead with gigantic plans of recovery and reconstruction, thus serving as a beacon light to the oppressed peoples of the West, demonstrating to them the way forward to Socialism and independence and calling them to resist the American plans for the enthralment and colonisation of Western Europe.

The Soviet Union emerged out of the war far stronger and more powerful. Successfully withstanding the test of the attack of German Fascism, it won victory in the war and is now masterfully striding *forward to new victories in Socialist construction.* The post-war Stalin Five-Year Plan is being successfully executed, so that by the end of the third quarter of 1948, industrial output had reached a level 17 per cent above the pre-war level. Simultaneously, the conditions of the people have rapidly improved; the real wages of the workers by November 1948 were more than twice the level in 1947.

A similar picture is there in the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe. This belt of States, uniting more than 80 million people, has decisively broken away from the imperialist system and taken the path to Socialism. Radical agrarian reform, breaking the landlord class, has been carried out; the main industries have been nationalised, and foreign capital's dominating position in the economies of these countries eliminated.

The result—as in the Soviet Union—has been rapid recovery and growing prosperity.

In Poland the 1947 level of production had already surpassed the pre-war per capita level. The expected target for 1948 (stated by President Bierut on October 28, 1948) was 25 to 30 per cent above the 1947 level, while real wages have surpassed the pre-war level.

Further, the new Poland has launched a gigantic Six-Year Plan, which aims by 1956 at doubling the 1949 level of industrial output and increasing by twice the living standards of the workers.

So also in Hungary, real wages doubled between August 1946 and August 1948. In Czechoslovakia, by 1948 end, industrial production has reached a level 20 per cent above the pre-war level, wages are 150 per cent the pre-war level. In Bulgaria, industrial production leapt up by 36 per cent in the first six months of 1948, compared to the previous year.

Similar is the progress in every country of Eastern Europe. Equally swift will be the progress in Northern Korea and in liberated China, as they also finally break the chains of feudal-capitalist exploitation and step forward along the road to Socialism.

Compare this swift and challenging progress to the chaos and misery for the masses of the capitalist world —and it is possible to grasp the enormous influence that the USSR and the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe have on the movements led by the working class and toiling masses of every country, directed at the liberation of their countries from the domination of Wall Street imperialism and its local capitalist-feudal allies.

These resistance movements, these liberation movements inside every country, are aimed at the defence of independence and democracy, are inspired by the great achievements and progress in the USSR and the People's Democracies. In them they see, in the concrete, in real life, that freed from the clutches of the deadly Marshall Plan, having broken the chains of capitalist exploitation, these peoples are making rapid advances to new heights of prosperity.

At the same time, every move of the American

imperialists to subjugate the world is continuously opposed and fought by the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. The Marshall Plan, the interventionist colonial wars in Greece, China, Indonesia and Viet Nam, each of these is faced with the firm opposition of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies—further inspiring the peoples of the capitalist world with the desire and confidence to fight back American aggression and to end the capitalist system that breeds poverty, enslavement and war.

This is also why the bitter anger and hatred of the capitalists is reserved for the Soviet Union. No lie, no vilification, no slander, is too great if it can serve as a weapon to blacken the reputation of the world's first Socialist State that refuses to be terrorised into submission but proudly starts forth to head the ever-swelling resistance to American plans for world domination.

And as this resistance grows, increasingly the Wall Street monopolists turn toward war as the only way out. Like Hitler in his day, today they are dreaming and organising for war in order to achieve world supremacy, in order to save the imperialist system from the advancing popular forces of democracy and Socialism.

War, these megalomaniacs dream, is the only way *out*: the only way to crush the challenging forces of the working class and toiling masses headed by the Soviet Union: the only way to enslave not only the peoples of the capitalist world, but also the peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union: the only way to grab and swallow the rich resources and huge markets of the Eldorado of the capitalist dreamer — the Socialist quarter of the globe.

At the same time, war is a very profitable proposition for the monopolists; already they are feeling the stirrings of the cold wind of economic crisis; exports are falling, export markets are becoming harder and harder to get.

So much as a drowning man clutches at a straw, the billionaires of Wall Street clutch at the prospect of war as their salvation from all evils—war with its huge armament orders that will fill the rapidly-growing gap

between production and consumption.

Thus, for them preparations for war will serve a double purpose. on the one hand, they pave the way for a full-scale military attempt at world conquest, at establishing American domination; on the other, they increase government orders for munitions, etc., and defer the outset of an economic crisis

On March 29, the US *Journal of Commerce* wrote that the three-billion-dollar rearmament programme proposed by Defence Secretary, Forrestal—

> "means a considerable acceleration of military buying during the months ahead. Industries producing munitions and supplies for the armed forces will receive good-sized orders."

The next day the same journal reported that the United Aircraft Corporation had received in connection with increased government orders a profit of 9,800,000 dollars compared with 4,500,000 dollars the previous year, and commented:

> "It is believed that this indicates what other aircraft manufacturers can achieve this year as a result of larger government defence orders."

So also we have a tribute in the *US News and World Report* last July:

> "Armament, if carried forward on the basis of plans being approved by Congress, will continue for at least five years to be a major US industry."

And no wonder, for to take only one instance, Congress figures (according to the Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Bridges) for the granting of *new* contracts to aircraft corporations are as follows:

1949	..	2,911 war planes
1950	..	4,096 "
1951	..	4,589 "
1952	..	5,200 "

By October, Wall Street's press had become quite open and shameless in its admiration for Truman's armament programme.

Barron's Financial Weekly cheerfully wrote on October 4, 1948:

> "All fear of a business set-back should now be removed by the revelation that a plan for military aid, patterned on the ECA (i.e., Marshall Plan) proposals, will be one of the first problems submitted to Congress next January."

Four days later, its contemporary, the *Journal of Commerce,* added its piece of testimony, declaring:

> "As long as the armament prop remains under business... We still find it difficult to believe that a 'collapse' in demand is imminent."

What a commentary on the capitalist system, the much-vaunted system of free enterprise, that its chief "prop" should be armament orders! Yet such is capitalism in its last moribund stage.

This drive towards war, so profitable for the US monopolies, is cloaked by adopting—again like Hitler—the flag of anti-Communism. The American monopolists attempt to conceal their real predatory aims by pointing to the imaginary threat of war on the part of the Soviet Union, by offering to act as the saviour of "Christian civilization," of "Western democracy" and the rest of the clap-trap periodically rolled out by the paid scribblers of Wall Street.

But facts are facts; and irresistible facts show that the American drive to war is a drive aimed at conquest of the world, enslavement of all nations.

And there is no shame, no half-heartedness in describing the objective of the war. Examine the writings of every literary hack employed by the monopolists and the same answer will be there—war against the Soviet Union.

For it is the Soviet Union that today heads the world popular forces fighting against the American monopolists' expansionist plans. It is the Soviet Union that stands like a fortress, blocking the path of Wall Street, *refusing to be blackmailed and threatened into* surrender, rousing all the peoples to come forward in the struggle for independence, democracy and Social-

ism, in the struggle for peace and against imperialism's war plans.

Hence the bitter hatred of the Soviet Union, the unprincipled and lying anti-Soviet campaign, the open incitement to anti-Soviet war.

First and foremost, of course, is Winston Churchill, the arch-warmonger, who in a speech at Llandudno in October 1948 declared:

> "We ought to bring matters to head and make a final settlement. The Western nations will be far more likely to reach a lasting settlement without bloodshed if they formulate their just (!) demands while they have the atomic power and before the Russians have it."

What else is this except a call to immediate anti-Soviet war? "Frame your demands, Gentlemen of the Imperialist World, frame your greedy, rapacious imperialist demands; put them before the Soviet Union; if she refuses to accept them, launch an atomic war!" —such is the theme of Churchill's speech of hate.

Another equally shameless inciter of anti-Soviet war is William Bullitt, former US Ambassador, first to Moscow and later to Paris. In his book *The Great Globe Itself* (published as long ago as 1946), Bullitt in the opening pages indicates whom he believes to be the "enemy."

> "There is but one nation that we do fear may some day use the atomic bomb against us. We fear the Soviet Union." (Page 4)

So what is to be done?

Regretfully Bullitt declares: "We alone had the atomic bomb but...we did not know how to use it" (pp. 151-152). However, he consoles himself, the chance is not yet lost; the monopoly still belongs to us and we should not wait till other nations, particularly the Soviet Union, possess the bomb.

So Bullitt, too, is a man of the Churchill school, a sponsor of the "preventive" atomic war.

Then aside from these highly-placed and influential "statesmen", men in the confidence of the pre-

sent rulers of Britain and the USA— for we should not forget that Bullitt is a whole-hearted supporter of the present US foreign policy, as Churchill is of Bevin's —there are other lesser peddlers of the wares of US Big Business, hundreds in number who soil the pages of American magazines with their warmongering ravings. Here I quote only three typical examples

One is the "famous" Ely Culbertson, who till now was only well known as on expert adviser on how to pick the other man's pocket at the bridge table. In 1947 he suddenly blossomed out as an open advocate of a preventive war, writing a fair-sized pamphlet: *Must We Fight Russia?*

Here is Culbertson's argument:

> "The rules of power politics are the only rules that govern the relations among sovereign States today...
>
> In another ten years Russia will equal America in industrialisation and will eventually surpass us...
>
> Our time limit for atomic monopoly is about three years or less..."

And therefore:

> "When a State has overwhelming power—military power and moral (!) power—to do with the world what it chooses, international affairs become very, very simple."

Or, in other words, use this power, the atomic power, to impose its will on the world.

Culbertson, maybe, is only a dim-witted and rather reckless amateur at world politics. But then what is one to say of Walter Lippmann, famed American journalist, who, in early 1947, wrote in the Italian newspaper *Messagero*:

> "The enormous possibilities of atomic weapons bear out the fact that we are able to establish and shall establish a world State governed by universal law."

Culbertson, the raw recruit to the art of serving the US monopolies in their anti-Soviet propaganda drive, is perhaps a trifle crude. But, in essence, is there

any difference between his stand and that of Lippmann?

There are other propagandists of a similar type, who, however, dress themselves up in a "scientific" garb. One such is Ansley J. Coale, who in 1947 published a book with the learned title *The Problem of Reducing Vulnerability to Atomic Bombs* (Princeton University Press, 1947). Coale's book represents a detailed report prepared for the Committee on the Social and Economic Aspects of Atomic Energy of the Social Science Research Council.

But in fact Coale's book is another war book, the writer of which Churchill would certainly be prepared to decorate. For Coale after pages of frightening jargon and figures to prove that there is absolutely no defence against the atom bomb, comes to the final conclusion:

> "The method of avoiding war that most naturally suggests itself is that of intimidating nations that might otherwise attack...*It is the method of the big stick* The atomic bomb is the biggest stick yet made."

These are only a few examples of the warmongering propaganda of the agents of the American trusts. But what is even more important to note is that the rulers of America by no means confine themselves to propaganda. On the contrary, their greatest efforts are today concentrated on making the "big stick" of Coale bigger and bigger.

America's war expenditure is rising steeply. In 1947, about 21 billion dollars, or 54 per cent of the total budget of 39 billion dollars, were devoted to war purposes. In 1948, the percentage rose to 66.3. And as for 1949, let us allow the recognised High Priest of the Dollar, President Truman, to speak.

> "In the fiscal year 1949," he declared in his budget message of 1948, "79 per cent of our expenditures reflect the costs of the war, the effects of war and our efforts to prevent a future war (or rather prepare a new war—*Writer*)...Only 21 per cent of our expenditures finance the Government's programmes in the broad areas of social

welfare, housing, education, research, agriculture, natural resources, transportation, finance, commerce, industry, labour and general administration."

In 1948 the US Army and Air Forces had a strength of 1,070,000, with another 550,000 in the Navy. Further plans were in hand to form a National Guard of 700,000 and an Organised Reserve of about 1,000,000. In addition, under the present scheme of Universal Military Training, one million young men are to be sent to army camps every year.

All these, together with the 1,100,000 civilians employed in the various military establishments, make up a total of more than five million men under military command in the USA.

Here, therefore, is the "big stick"—which also has in its possession over 500 army, navy and air bases all over the world—outside the territory of the USA. From Dahran in Saudi-Arabia to Tsingtao in China, from Iceland to Greece and Turkey, throughout the world on every one of the five continents and on islands in all the seven great oceans, the Stars and Stripes flies—ready and willing at the service of the "big stick."

And no secret is made of the fact that all these bases are being got together for the single aim of attacking the Soviet Union.

Eight months ago, the influential American magazine *United States News and World Report* in an editorial article openly admitted that the United States Air Force is being reformed for the eventuality of possible hostilities in Europe.

Revealing that the USSR is being encircled by the gathering combat forces, it frankly wrote:

> "The United States is attacking Russia chiefly from the air. The Mediterranean area, together with British and the Middle East, will be of primary importance. The Arctic will be of lesser significance in this operation. Southern Italy, Sicily and Turkey will serve as important bases. The atomic bomb will be used for attack on Russia proper." (April 9, 1948.)

But even this gigantic war preparation, even the fond belief that they are the monopoly owners of the atom bomb, is *not enough for the magnates* of Wall Street.

For such is their feeling of insecurity and panic that these enemies of humanity are also working frenziedly on the development of bacteriological warfare—in open defiance of the fact that the USA is a signatory to the Geneva Protocol of 1925 outlawing such warfare.

This was revealed not long ago by one George W. Merck, President of the firm of Merck and Co., Inc., one of the largest manufacturers of pharmaceutical preparations and laboratory and photochemical reagents in the USA and Chairman of the United States Biological Warfare Committee.

Merck in a report, hypocritically entitled *Science and Civilisation* (published in the *Chemical and Engineering News* some three years ago), goes into rhapsodic descriptions of bacteriological warfare, described by him as—

> "the use of bacteria, fungi, viruses, rickettsias, and toxic agents derived from living organisms to produce death or disease in men, animals or plants.

Research into this work, Merck declares, was carried on throughout the war by the Special Projects Division of the Chemical Warfare Service of the Army, which had a staff of 3,900. In this so-called report, Merck also details the various accomplishments of this Division—the development of methods for mass production of "clouds of micro-organisms" of a "pure crystalline form of the bacterial toxin botulinum," which is the toxic element in spoiled foods and the most potent biological poison known to man.

Merck ends his report by calling for intensification of this work in peacetime—of course, with a view to the *promotion* of "lasting peace in the world."

In 1948 this same Merck, together with three professors of the University of Wisconsin, prepared a brochure for the US Atomic Energy Commission in which they wrote that—

"the development of biological warfare could very well proceed.... under the guise of legitimate medical or bacteriological research.

"Many plants designed and ostensibly built for industrial fermentation processes could be used for the mass production of pathogenic micro-organisms or their poisonous products."

This affection for developing biological warfare is not the individual pastime of a single scoundrel, George W. Merck, though that he is a scoundrel no one need doubt. In 1943, the anti-monopoly section of the US Department of Justice indicted the Merck Corporation for cartel arrangements with the Nazi enemy, forcing up prices of medical preparations, establishing monopolistic restrictions on trade, etc.

But Merck is not alone. The central organ of American militarism, *Army Ordnance*, in its March- April 1947 issue, expressed its great joy over the recent discovery of a crystalline bacteriological toxin, recently developed by the Special Projects Division.

According to this semi-official magazine, research on this toxin (on which 50 million dollars had been spent) proved it a "new super-deadly" poison, one ounce of which is "potentially enough to kill 180,000,000 human beings."

Such, therefore, are the plans of these mass murderers of mankind. For the sake of their profits, they do not shrink from developing any and every kind of weapon of destruction.

The Wall Street monopolists, therefore, represent the new danger to the peace of the world and the independence of nations. Desperately seeking to save the crumbling imperialist order, they are pursuing a blatantly expansionist war policy, aimed at bringing the world under American domination.

It is inevitable, therefore, that they should sabotage any attempt at international control of atomic energy. Faced with the rising opposition of the democratic anti-imperialist forces, they look upon what they imagine to be their monopolist possession of the atom bomb as their only salvation.

III. ATOMIC ENERGY FOR PEACE

THE HISTORIC RESOLUTION of the United Nations General Assembly of January 24, 1946, setting up the UNO Atomic Energy Commission, directed the Commission not only to work for the abolition of the use of atomic energy for war purposes but also to extend its development for peaceful purposes. To quote the first item of the terms of reference:

> "A. For extending between all nations the exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful ends."

Yet such has been the propaganda of the American trusts that the question of utilisation of atomic energy for peaceful purposes has been pushed totally into the background. In fact, such utilisation would mark virtually the beginning of a new epoch in the life of man, putting within his reach untold power for the development of human wealth, for the raising of the standard of living of humanity.

But it is this very prospect that frightens the American trusts. If the common man would welcome the atomic era because it would be an era of abundant production, the monopolies dread it for the same reason.

This fear of the monopolies is seldom openly expressed: but sometimes it penetrates into the light of day. One example is to be found in the article by Robert De Vore in *Colliers'* magazine of May 3, 1947.

De Vore in his article relates how Senators Arthur Vandenburg (one of the "makers" of US foreign policy) and Brian MacMahon brought forward a peculiar new Act, peculiar in that the US Congress, for the first time in its history, was asked to lay down "that a man could not get a patent on a patentable idea."

But this law, says De Vore, even "goes further than that. It says that a man who invents a machine driven by atomic energy not only may not manufacture without a licence, but may not enjoy the right to exclusive production of that machine which his patent would normally grant him. Thus—and again for the first time in history—Congress wrote compulsory licensing into law."

De Vore then describes how these two eminent Senators, in order to make understandable the provisions of this Act to the rather dull-witted cretins who make up the US Senate (one of these backward specimens is reported to have exclaimed on reading the Act in Bill form: "Hell, this is Socialism!") gave a "dramatic illustration" of the way in which uncontrolled development of atomic energy can affect "the lives of all Americans."

> "Suppose, they (the two Senators) said," De Vore writes, "that a man suddenly announced he had invented an atomic locomotive which could run from New York to Washington on a few dollars' worth of atomic fuel.
>
> All railroad and coal company stocks would be worthless, they said. Insurance companies with railroad investments would go broke and there would be pretty general financial chaos. This, they admitted, was rather an extreme case, but you have to guard against extreme cases when you are dealing with atomic energy."

It goes without saying, of course, that these worries are essentially the worries of the capitalist, the owner of stocks and shares, not of the common people, whether in New York or in Delhi, who would embrace with joy the prospect described by the worthy Senators.

One well-known American physicist and scientific contributor, Robert D. Potter, has also described the fever of alarm in which these monopolists live today.

Writing in his book *The Atomic Revolution* (published in 1947), Potter says:

> "The companies that own the coal mines and oil-fields of the world have men at the top whose foreheads are growing wrinkles daily as they

ponder atomic energy versus the energy released by mere chemical reactions; as they consider the energies releasable from atoms in the new energy age compared with the energies available in the raw materials on which their industries have been built. In particular these men of industry who trade in coal and oil would like to shake the nightmares that creep into their minds at night—visions of the day when the 'liquid gold' and 'black diamonds' in which they have been dealing these many years are replaced by the atoms of ordinary air or water."

Long ago, Comrade Lenin, the leader of world humanity, wrote how "with every day, capitalist technology is more and more outgrowing the social conditions which condemn the working people to wage slavery." (*A Big Technical Achievement*, 1913.)

Nothing proves the truth of Lenin's brilliant formulation more than the present plight of the capitalists in the face of the great and wonderful possibilities of the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Even Potter, who is a hireling of the Hearst monopoly press, cannot conceal his enthusiasm at this prospect. He relates that were America to spend two billion dollars on research for developing atomic energy for peaceful purposes, in a few years scientists would be able to develop the use of atomic energy not in uranium but even in common materials.

This would open up a new era for humanity. The vastly reduced cost of producing energy would lead to tremendous productive developments. With new and cheap sources of energy at his disposal man could go forward to new conquests—to influence the weather, bringing rain or sunshine as he wished—to heat the sea, e.g., arctic currents, artificially so as to make the polar wastes habitable—to transform deserts like the Sahara and the Gobi into gardens feeding vast areas—to organise inter-planetary flights on rocket planes—and so on.

Countless and limitless are the possibilities, and there is no doubt that one day man will achieve them.

But not under capitalism.

A well-known Brazilian scientist, Mario Schenberg, writing in the weekly *Journal de Debates* (July 5, 1947), explained just why.

> "Utilisation of atomic energy for peaceful purposes in capitalist countries," he wrote, "can only lead to still greater overproduction and thereby create still greater difficulties for capitalists and politicians upholding the interests of capital.
>
> "An entirely different situation has arisen in the Soviet Union and other countries where economic democracy is developing. Only those nations have a real interests in atomic energy who can expand their industrial production without the interference of capitalism, now in the throes of its death agony."
>
> *"The era of atomic energy,"* the Professor concludes *"can only be the era of Socialism."* (Writer's emphasis)

And it is because the capitalist monopolies of the USA know this very well that they are striving today to put every obstacle in the way of the development of atomic energy for peaceful, constructive ends.

They are in a position to do this not only because they exercise a dominating influence over Government policy—but also because they are the direct owners and, therefore, masters of the fate of the sources of raw materials and the factories today producing atomic energy and atom bombs in the USA.

For this entire field in the USA is dominated by four huge concerns.

First, the International Radium and Uranium Consortium which owns the Canadian radium-ore deposits and controls the rich Katanga uranium mines in the Belgian Congo through its control of the Belgian concern, *Union Miniere de Haut Katanga.* It virtually controls all sources of uranium and radium in the capitalist world that are at present being exploited.

Second, the Westinghouse Company which monopolises the extraction of metallic uranium from the raw material.

Third, the General Electric Company, electrical monopoly trust, which controls the Hanford Atomic Materials Plant.

Fourth, the Monsanto Chemical Trust which has the Oak Ridge atomic installations at its disposal (whose Vice-President's opinion on the American plan for control was quoted earlier in Chapter II.)

Of course, nominally all these function under instructions of the US Atomic Energy Commission, but in fact, their own representatives control this Commission and, through a so-called 'Industrial Advisory Group,' frame the policy and actions of allotment of contracts.

The Industrial Advisory Group, declares the 1947 report of the Commission, will do this by "exploring opportunities for increased individual participation for profit and methods of developing incentives for industry to get into the field."

Thus, while all the research is done at Government laboratories and paid for by the tax-payer, its results are appropriated by the profiteers, who, speaking in the name of the Commission, have declared that:

> "New reserves of source materials can best be developed (at Government expense — *Writer*) by competitive private industry under the stimulus of profits. . . ."

Thus the production of atomic energy is at the mercy and under the total control of these big US monopolies.

These concerns, speaking for the entire American capitalist class and working through the Government, have functioned hand-in-hand to thwart the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

As long ago as 1946, the Science Editor, O'Neill, of the very conservative *New York Herald Tribune* wrote criticising Government policy in this respect. The secret of atomic energy had been uncovered for some years; yet, he wrote:

> "During that time industrial and Government institutions should have been active working against time, to make atomic energy available for

constructive uses. Instead, not the slightest trace of progress has been made in this direction. Instead, the military authorities have been making every effort to monopolise the entire field of atomic energy as a military project in which civilians will have participation only as such action pleases the military authorities."

"No greater stupidity," comments O'Neill bitingly, "can be imagined than the efforts of the military authorities completely to sew up the uranium atomic energy project and make the scientists the slaves of the generals, when, by so doing, they are completely halting researches in other approaches to releasing atomic energy, perhaps in ways that are far more practical for civilian utilisation.'

"Work on all of these processes," he declares, "is being held up while a very stupid military dictatorship in Washington, through Congressional action and threats of action under espionage laws, keeps science on the anxious seat."

And O'Neill concludes his devastating critique of US Government policy with the word:

"Every possible step toward making atomic energy available for human welfare applications has been completely and ruthlessly suppressed by the military clique."

This has been the uniform experience of foreign scientists also; the famous French scientist, Irene Joliot-Curie (daughter of the discoverer of radium), in an interview in 1947 with the *Palestine Post* sharply criticised the "American 'iron curtain' on atomic energy" and said·

"We (she and her husband, Frederic Joliot-Curie) won the Nobel Prize in 1935 for discovering artificial radio elements. In 1946, however, we have so far not been successful in obtaining our own discovery to take back to our country. Yet these elements would be useful for medical and biological research."

Frederic Joliot-Curie also criticised the US Government for its continuous emphasis on the destructive aspects of atomic energy. Writing in the magazine *United Nations World* (March 1947), he declares:

> "The terrifying possibility of having to burrow like ants beneath the soil and build cities in the caves of the earth at present overshadows in the popular mind the benign potentialities of our new knowledge. Nor is the sense of danger relieved by the decision of the United States that 'it must hide its technical and scientific advance in nuclear physics behind an American iron curtain'."

Joliot-Curie also refers to the tremendous concentration of money and men at the US atomic centre at the Manhattan Project — over a thousand men work there, but "all that this great centre produces is bombs."

It is not only in relation to the application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes that the American militarists have put innumerable obstacles. They have also come four-square in the way of utilisation of any radio-active substance for medical purposes, for the succour of suffering humanity. In May 1946, the magazine *Popular Science* published an editorial attacking General Groves, the then boss of US atomic production and research, for pursuing a policy which was responsible for "the blank spaces in the record of medical research." One of the consequences of this policy has been that radio-active iodine goes uselessly up the smoke-stacks of the atom bomb plants while the treatment of thyroid cancer with radio-active iodine costs 10,000 dollars.

The liberal *Nation*, supporting *Popular Science* in its vigorous indictment of General Groves, declared:

> "General Groves, in denying desperately needed medical benefits to the American people, convicted himself of a social stupidity that is outstanding even in a military man"

These repeated criticisms and denunciations of American militarist policy evidently shook General Groves and other high-ups in charge of the atomic

energy plants. And so, early in 1947, they announced with great eclat that a large experimental station for the production of atomic energy for industrial purposes was going to be set up at Oak Ridge under the direction of the Monsanto Chemical Co. and the Manhattan military district, headed by General Groves.

Two million five hundred dollars were generously set apart for financing this project. Of course, this represents only one-half of one per cent of what was then spent annually on production of atom bombs and on the promotion of military uses of nuclear energy.

But still the scientists and the peoples of the world could be thankful that a small corner of the militarists' iron curtain had been lifted. And throughout 1947 and 1948, repeated reports appeared that construction of this plant was about to begin. However, it seems that it never began and now nothing is heard about it.

What happened? The key to unravelling this mystery was provided in April 1948 by Leonard Engel, the scientific correspondent of the American liberal weekly *Nation,* in an article entitled "No Atoms For Peace."

Engel revealed that the Oak Ridge scheme failed because General Groves and the other bosses of the Manhattan district deliberately made two decisions directed to ensure its failure: first, an impossible basic design was chosen for the projected plant, and secondly, a poor site.

After describing in detail these two intentional mistakes, Engel concludes by stating that the announcement by the militarists of the proposed construction of an experimental plant was only a publicity stunt.

And now a decision has been taken that all pile design be transferred from Oak Ridge to the Argonne National Laboratory which will now start — from the beginning—the work the Oak Ridge plant was supposed to do. Eighteen months have passed by, nothing has been done—only the militarists can rejoice that they have disrupted and postponed the possibility of the application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Such is the story of how the American monopolists and their militarist agents, fearful of the consequences

of the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, have sabotaged all research into such development.

But who should be surprised at this?

The Monsanto Chemical Trust—does *it not* also share the nightmares of the rest of the American capitalist class that atomic energy for peaceful purposes will drive it out of business, render its present factories worthless?

The General Electric Company (GEC) are the biggest monopolist owners of plants producing electrical goods and electrical energy; they are the owners of the Hanford Plant. Is it not obvious the GEC would do its best to sabotage the development of research into atomic energy for peaceful purposes? For such a development would certainly affect the electrical industry and no one can tell today to what extent and in what manner.

Thus, the domination of American monopolies in the sphere of atomic energy in the USA has had a double result. On the one hand, a violent speeding up of production and stock-piling of atom bombs and of research into production of other atomic weapons of mass destruction; on the other hand, a total sabotage of research into the application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

And there is no doubt that so long as the monopolies remain in power in the United States such will be the picture for the future.

The conclusions that emerge from this are clear.

If we are to stop war, we must bridle the warmongers, disarm the imperialists — the monopolist trusts; *there is no other way.* So long as the monopolists continue to dominate any country, so long there is a danger of war. For monopoly capitalism is war.

Equally, if we are to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes, if we are to usher in a new era of unimaginable prosperity for mankind through the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, *the domination of the trusts must end.*

There is no other way—either to peace or to prosperity.

IV. TWO CAMPS IN THE WORLD

THE LAST SESSION of the UNO General Assembly has brought out into sharpest relief the nature of the opposing camps on the world arena.

On one side, the Socialist Soviet Union, fighting for *peace and freedom for all nations.*

On the other, the United States, leader of the imperialist camp, conspiring to unleash a third atomic world war.

At this session, from the Soviet side came a clear forthright resolution—proposed by its chief delegate, Andrei Vyshinsky.

Here is the text of this resolution:

> "(1) That the General Assembly recommend to the permanent members of the Security Council, as the first step in the reduction of armaments and armed forces, a reduction by one-third within one year of all their existing land, naval, and air forces.
>
> (2) That the General Assembly recommend the prohibition of the atomic weapon as a weapon intended for aggressive and not defensive purposes.
>
> (3) That the General Assembly recommend the establishment of an international body within the framework of the Security Council to watch over and control the implementation of these measures."

The Soviet delegation consistently and firmly fought for the adoption of this resolution; in an effort to reach real agreement, it even offered to add two important points to its resolution.

First, on October 2, it proposed:

> "A convention on the prohibition of atomic weapons and a convention to provide for effective international control of atomic energy should be signed and put into force simultaneously."

Thus, instead of the prohibition of the atomic weapon preceding the establishment of the control system—the natural procedure—the Soviet Union, as a concession, agreed that these be simultaneous.

Secondly, in answer to the objection that armaments could not be reduced unless at the same time the exact strength of the Soviet armed forces was made known, the leader of the Soviet delegation, Vyshinsky, proposed on October 12:

> "If a positive decision is taken here at the General Assembly on the Soviet Union's proposals to prohibit atomic energy for war purposes and for the five Great Powers to cut down their armaments and armed forces by one-third, the Soviet Union, simultaneously with other States, will present information both about its armed forces and about its armaments."

Such was the stand of the Soviet Union at the UNO General Assembly—a stand for peace, a stand for ending of the armaments race by instituting a substantial reduction in armaments, a stand for abolition of the use of the atomic weapon for war, with strict control to ensure that such abolition is really given effect to by all Powers.

What was the reply of the USA?

Every proposal of the Soviet Union was rejected; on the contrary, the Soviet Union was accused of intensifying the crisis by putting forward such proposals, of increasing distrust and lack of confidence, of heightening international tension.

The Soviet Union suggests a reduction in armaments by one-third—but this leads to increasing distrust, replies the USA.

The Soviet Union suggests abolition of the atomic

weapon—but this means heightening international tension, replies the USA.

This is how truth becomes a lie, and white is transformed into black by the imperialists.

One has only to pursue this argument to its logical conclusion to see its utter ridiculousness. One has only to ask the USA: Would it, then, in your opinion, be the best contribution towards peace, towards decreasing international tension, towards developing mutual trust—if the Soviet Union proposed a one-third *increase* in all armaments and a speed-up of the production of atomic weapons?

And when this was pointed out to Wall Street's representative, Mr. Bevin (for this was his role in Paris), he fell back on another age-old imperialist argument. Disarmament was all right, he said, but before disarmament must come security. Unless the nations were confident about their security, they could not disarm.

Now this in fact has been the argument against disarmament advanced by the imperialists ever since 1922 when twenty-six years ago the Soviet Union made its first proposal for disarmament. At that time, at the Genoa Conference in the spring of 1922, this argument was put forward by the French representative.

Five years later, in November 1927, the Soviet Union put forward a convention for immediate compulsory disarmament.

This too was rejected. In the forefront of those who heaped calumny on the Soviet Union for indulging in a "propagandist manoeuvre" was Lord Cushenden, the British representative.

In February 1928, the Soviet delegate made a concession to the appetites of the imperialists and put forward a proposal for a reduction in the armaments of Great Powers by 50 per cent and of the small Powers by 33.3 per cent. Again this was rejected by the imperialists.

Once more in 1932, at the Genoa Disarmament Conference, the Soviet Union put forward a plan for partial disarmament. This was rejected by the other Powers, some of the delegates giving the pretext that

they preferred the American proposal of President Hoover for partial disarmament. The Soviet delegation promptly moved that the American proposal be adopted. This, too, was rejected—by all the capitalist Powers, including, let us note, the original sponsor of the proposal, the USA.

And on every occasion, parrot-like, the same moth-eaten imperialist argument was trotted out: security before disarmament. And on this occasion also, in 1948, this same argument is brought out.

But what is the essence of this argument?

In pre-war days, its essence was expressed in the infamous, eternally infamous, Pact of Munich. This pact which betrayed Czechoslovakia into the blood-stained hands of Hitler, was welcomed with hails and hosannas by Chamberlain and Daladier as ensuring "peace in our time," ensuring "security." The real meaning of Munich, as is patent to the smallest infant in international affairs today, was that it opened the road to Hitlerite aggression on the Soviet Union and to a four-Power (Germany, Italy, Britain and France) pact directed to sustain such aggression. It divided Europe into two and organised Western Europe as an anti-Soviet bloc, spearheaded by Hitlerite Germany. Such was the imperialist understanding of "security." That the gamble failed, that Hitler first turned west, to easier pastures, was through no lack of trying on the part of these gentlemen of London and Paris. Soviet might was Soviet might—and Hitler took account of it for a time. He conquered all Europe before he dared to attack eastwards.

But now do we not see the outlines of the same vicious "security" emerging in the world? What else then is the Western Union (including, be it noted, a restored re-Nazified Western German State) than a bloc of the States of Western Europe organised for anti-Soviet war?

It is this that is the real meaning of Bevin's argument of "security before disarmament."

But Bevin had yet a further argument against the Soviet proposal.

Disarmament? he asks. There can be no disarma-

ment, he answers, so long as the USSR by its aggressive actions poisons and sullies the international atmosphere.

Is this the truth? Is it the Soviet Union that is pursuing an aggressive policy today?

Let us look at the facts.

The Soviet Union has no bases in Venezuela, 6,000 miles from the Soviet frontier and 900 miles from the frontiers of the USA; but the USA has air bases at Dahran in Saudi Arabia, 6,000 miles from the US frontier and 900 miles from the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union has no bases in Northern Canada, a few hundred miles from the US frontier; but the USA has air and naval bases in Japan and air bases in South Korea, only a few hundred miles from the Soviet frontier.

The Soviet Union has not contravened the Potsdam decisions and divided Germany; but the USA has, and in the train of this decision is rebuilding Western Germany as an anti-Soviet *place d'armes*, ruled by a combination of ex-Nazis like Dr. Schacht, militarists like General Halder and monopoly industrialists like Krupps.

Or, again, the Soviet Union withdraws its troops from Northern Korea; but the USA retains its troops in Southern Korea.

Or, again, who is intervening in Greece? Whose military mission rules Greece's Army? Let the Greeks speak, not the "Slavic" Greek Communists whose voice is suppressed in Athens, but the true-blooded Greeks of "Western Christian civilisation," gentlemen whose newspaper the fascist and American rulers of Greece permit to appear in Athens.

Here is what the "liberal" *Eleftheria*, a supporter of the royalist-fascist government (!) wrote recently:

> "General Van Fleet (head of the US Military Mission in Greece) by poking his nose everywhere, writing, talking, pushing himself to the fore all the time, has given *the impression that the Greek Chief* of Staff, General Yiantzis, is fulfilling the function *of batman to General Van Fleet*"!

And whose bullets shoot down Malayan guerillas and the partisans of Viet Nam? Whose aeroplanes shower bombs on the fighters for China's and Indonesia's liberation?

Whose else—except those of Wall Street, for it is Wall Street's gold and Wall Street's arms that buttress every one of the tottering degenerate imperial Powers of the West and the foul decay of Chiang Kai-shek's dictatorship?

Is it not clear that those who talk of "soiling the international atmosphere," it is these very gentlemen who are soiling, befouling it with their guns and dollars?

No—all these arguments of Wall Street's most faithful lackey, Bevin, are only decorative verbiage. The falsity of his last final argument reveals this most clearly.

The Soviet move is only for propaganda reasons; they are not serious about it—such is the trend of the final argument.

But if it is for propaganda, if it is just bluff, why not call the bluff? Why not accept the Soviet proposal?

And to this the imperialists have no reply, because they know the Soviet proposal is not "bluff" and that if accepted, their own plans would be blown sky-high.

This is why, using their mechanical majority of satellites in UNO, they defeated the Soviet resolutions. Instead, they ensured the passing of a resolution on atomic energy that virtually closes down the UNO Atomic Energy Commission (of course, on the ostensible ground that the Soviet Union will not "cooperate") and gives a green light to the atom-mongers to go ahead with their plans for a third world war.

The resolution passed by the UNO General Assembly (called the Canadian resolution after its sponsor) in all its essentials approves of the majority report of the UNO Atomic Energy Commission, the report that is based on the Baruch Plan, and therefore approves the American war plans.

Thus with the adoption of this resolution by UNO begins a new stage in the fight against war and for peace.

The aggressive imperialists are moving forward swiftly to complete their preparations for war.

In the West, the open steps towards the partition of Germany and the building up of a Nazified Western Germany, the appointment of the heads of armed forces of the Western Union and the loudly talked about projects for an Atomic Pact herald the stage of open military preparations. Recently Stuart Gelder, *News Chronicle* correspondent in New York, revealed that:

> "The £2,000 million *military* Marshall Plan to build a Western alliance against Russia is moving towards the *final stages of preparation*. A State Department spokesman informed me yesterday that whichever party is in power next January blue-prints will be submitted to Congress for approval."

Heading this military bloc will be the spearhead of Western Germany, because American plans to build Western Germany as the war base against the East are far advanced.

Already, whatever dismantling of German war industry (and there was precious little) that was being carried out in the Western zones has stopped; and the Allied Control Council recently revealed that out of 284 Nazi *war* factories in the British zone, due for dismantling under the Potsdam Agreement, 24 have been actually dismantled; out of 117 in the American zone, not a single one has been dismantled.

Thus, tank plants, aircraft factories, munition works, underground chemical and strategic material plants, submarine yards—in fact, every industry in the *vast network that nourished the Nazi juggernaut, stands* ready for use by its American successor.

All that is necessary is the revival of the basic coal, chemical and steel industries—and such is the principal objective of the huge Marshall Plan appropriations for Bizonia.

This in bare outline is the American plan to organise the West for war.

In the East, the then Finance Minister of Chiang

Kai-shek's regime, Wang Yun-wu, stated recently in his press conference in Washington that he and other representatives of the Far Eastern nations are studying the—

> "possibility of an Asiatic Union of nations for economic and political security on the lines of the Western European Union but aimed at support in a form similar to the European Recovery Programme."

According to the Wall Street Journal of September 28—

> "this project (an ERP for Asia) is being sparkplugged by India, China and the Philippines. Also participating are Pakistan, Burma, Indonesia, Indo-China, Hongkong, Singapore, Siam, North Borneo and neighbouring Brunei."

It is clear that preparations are far advanced for an American-sponsored Eastern Bloc, aimed at destroying the liberation movements of the countries of Asia and knock them together for aggression against the eastern frontiers of the Soviet Union.

At the same time, as the "unions" in East and West are organised, unions that are essentially war-alliances dominated by American imperialism, the old Fascists are also being given a position in this new Axis, this new unholy coalition.

Franco Spain is being white-washed and in the words of Senator Gurney, Chairman of the US Senate Armed Service Committee:

> "It is imperative that United States should accord with Spain in the fight against Communism." (*Times of India,* October 7.)

Gurney is reported to have had long and friendly talks with murder-expert Franco and after his visit, the West European press is full of reports that Franco Spain is expected to join the Western Bloc.

Thus here is this new coalition for war; the Dutch murderers of the Indonesian people; the British monopolists and the 200 families of France, led by de Gaulle;

German Nazis, now refurbished as defenders of Christian civilization; Franco, violator of the Spanish Republic—in the West; the degenerate Chiang regime in China; the Dutch colonialists of Indonesia and the French of Viet Nam; the British murderers of the Malayan people; the old Fascists of Japan—in the East; all banded together under the leadership of Wall Street. Such is the unholy character of the new anti-Comintern Axis, the new reactionary alliance for war.

The democratic and peace-loving forces in the world must see this new dangerous coalition and must fight against it.

For it can be fought and defeated. The democratic forces of the world, the Socialist Soviet Union, the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe, the advancing working-class movements of the Western Europe, in particular of France and Italy, the powerful and gigantic colonial liberation movements of Asia, headed by the mighty Liberation Army of China—all these command sufficient force and strength to chain the would-be aggressors In fact, it is their very strength and their rapid advance during the last three years that has made the imperialist aggressors desperate.

This is why Churchill and his masters of Wall Street cry out for an immediate war, an immediate ultimatum to the Soviet Union—for, they are afraid that already they are lost, that the time is past when war and their atom bomb could smash the rising advancing forces of the people

However, in this period of preparation for unleashing aggression, the imperialists strive to conceal their desperation by a widespread propaganda of their overwhelming strength, of the incredible powers of the atom bomb, the supersonic self-guided missiles, and what not This way they aim to frighten the weak-nerved, to sow panic and fear among the common people, to engender defeatism and pessimism, a feeling of helplessness before uncontrollable forces. By widespread propaganda of such a nature, they hope to weaken the people's forces, paralyse their resistance and thus pave the way for their own victory.

Examples of the crudest forms of such propaganda

can be found throughout the American press. Here is one from the writings of John and Stewart Alsop, well-known scribblers in Wall Street's pay. A year ago (in September 1947) they published an article in the *Saturday Evening Post* which paints a picture of overwhelming atomic force.

The Alsops are worshippers of the self-guided missile of various types; here is how they gloat over the description of the anti-aircraft missile:

> "From its launching ramp it will soar upward in a few seconds to 60,000 feet or more and there, by radar, will strike down the fastest modern bomber as a hawk strikes down a heron."

But this is not their real love. No, the most attractive weapon they envisage is a—

> "genuine guided missile of inter-continental range—the rocket or ram-jet capable of striking at a chosen target from half a world away, travelling at such speed that interception will be impossible, bringing total destruction with the suddenness of a thunder-clap."

Such is the insatiable appetite of the advocates of anti-Soviet atomic war. Drunk with the prospect of atomic power, they build a world of fantastic illusions—a world which, if any man believed in it, would lead to a complete loss of faith in the future of mankind.

But the world of the Alsops is a dream world. Even they admit that the production of these weapons will take at least ten to twenty years. And that is a very conservative estimate.

Professor Blackett, for instance, in his book mentioned earlier, sums up the position thus.

> "Though rockets of the German V2 type might possibly be built to carry an atomic war-head a distance of a few hundred miles, the technical problem of making. . .a rocket with a range of a 1,000 miles or more is very formidable. The view

of the *American Navy* has been expressed as follows:

'...It seems a wholly reasonable and safe assumption that rockets with atomic war-heads, capable of thousands of miles of range, are not to be expected for at least twenty-five years!'" (P. 48)

But despite the fact that even high American strategists support this view, we find that F. H. Osborne, US deputy representative on the UNO Atomic Energy Commission, declaiming that—

"The aeroplane or rocket carrying atomic explosives is a conclusive weapon. It extends the power of those possessing it to the furthest corner of this planet" (Quoted by Prof. Blackett in his book, p. 50.)

What else is the aim of this statement than to *frighten the ordinary* common people with the concept of an all-destructive super-weapon—for anyone who has studied this question soberly, as Professor Blackett repeatedly and decisively proves, knows very well that Osborne's boastful remarks are pure nonsense.

Despite all propaganda about the development of such sensational weapons, the fact is that they are yet very far from being practicable propositions.

This has been admitted in a report of the Temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board to the US Senate last March. This report urges the Air Force and Navy to stop misleading the public on American *aircraft* performance, apart from other more imaginative weapons. The report emphasises that record achievements, such as supersonic flights (i.e., at a speed above the speed of sound) cannot be utilised for combat purposes for years to come and flights of 10,000 miles are at present possible only when the aircraft are "stripped down" (i.e., flying with no cargo of bombs). The much-boosted B-50, for instance, has an effective radius of only 1,700 miles.

So also Professor Blackett writes:

"...It is safe to conclude that within...the next five years, piloted bombers with a range over,

say, 1,500 miles, which can be expected to be in service in large numbers, will be so inferior in speed and manoeuvrability as to be extremely vulnerable to contemporary fighters, and probably also to improved anti-aircraft weapons...So in this period we must conclude that effective inter-continental war is not possible..." (P. 53)

Professor Blackett here again quotes American naval authorities as holding the view that "the present technological trend is decidedly in favour of the defence as against the offence in ordinary strategic bombing....and a decidedly favours the defence of large *centres of population and industry*." (P. 51)

And if this is true of aircraft performance, it is far more true of atomic weapons and self-guided missiles. But the American atom-mongers are not concerned with truth. In their desire to frighten the common people and, it should be added, to convince themselves that they hold the world in the palm of their hand, they have developed the theory (expressed frankly by Osborne) that the atomic weapon is decisive for modern war.

In doing this—as in many other things—they are only following in the footsteps of the imperialist military theoreticians of the past One has only to recall the pre-war theories of the British tank expert, General Fuller, (later developed by Hitler's war chief, Marshall Guiderian) that tanks will win the next war; or of the Italian Fascist, General Douhet, who theorised on the absolute impossibility of defence against air attack, a theory that became the foundation of British imperial air strategy in the last war.

The bankruptcy of these theories of the "decisive weapon," of the one-sided development of one or the other weapon, when, in fact, no single weapon is decisive in modern warfare, was exposed by the second world war when the Red Army demonstrated that only a perfection of all arms and their skilful co-ordination on land, air and sea, backed by the united strength of the people, is decisive.

We have, for example, Prof. Blackett's testimony

on the failure of the British theory that heavy bombing from the air could destroy the war potential of Germany and force her to surrender

Prof. Blackett declares that in January 1943 the Anglo-Americans planned and executed a bombing offensive over Germany that had as its objective "the destruction and dislocation of the German military and industrial system."

> "The remarkable and unexpected result," reveals Prof. Blackett, after making a detailed analysis of the effect of these air-raids, "was the discovery that German total war production continued to increase till the summer of 1944, in spite of the very heavy bombing...More aircraft were produced by the United Kingdom than Germany in every year of the war till 1944, when, for the first time, the German production was larger, in spite of the bombing" (p. 19).
>
> "It is clear," concludes Prof. Blackett, "that the effect of a strategic bombing campaign is dependent on the degree to which the economy of the attacked country is already strained by the demands of a major war effort on land...
>
> "In spite of the great developments of air power, it is clear that Germany's defeat in the second world war, as in the first, was brought about primarily by her huge losses in man-power and material incurred in the land battles, *particularly on the Eastern Front.*" (P. 16)

Prof Blackett, in fact, indicts the British policy of reliance on heavy bombing from the air as "one of the greatest numerical blunders of military history"! (P. 17).

This is the sober summing-up of the bankruptcy of one "decisive weapon" policy as practised by the British in the last war. We can be sure that the new-found advocates of atomic supremacy will turn out to be as bankrupt as their predecessors.

Generalissimo Stalin, the great leader of the Soviet people and shaper of their brilliant war strategy that defeated Hitler, stated this two years ago.

In an interview to Alexander Werth on September 24, 1946, he stated:

> "I do not believe the atomic bomb to be as serious a force as certain politicians are inclined to regard it. Atomic bombs are intended for intimidating the weak-nerved, but they cannot decide the outcome of war, since atomic bombs are by no means sufficient for this purpose."

On this issue also Professor Blackett after making a careful and detailed analysis of the effectiveness of the atom bomb, comes to this same conclusion:

> "Enough has been said," he writes, "to show convincingly the very obvious truth—though a truth somewhat obscured by a wave of inaccurate and superficial reasoning based on the destructive power of the atomic bomb—that a war between America and Russia would be of world-wide extent and would be *a war of all arms, and certainly of very long duration.*" (Page 73)

Further, in dealing with the current idea advanced by the American military strategists that the atom bomb is *the one decisive weapon,* he writes:

> "Of course, there are strategic situations in which atomic bombs would certainly have decisive results; but this is also true of other weapons too. It is equally certain that there are strategic situations in which atomic bombs would not be decisive and *it is undeniable that the only important war with the possibility of which the world is now faced (i.e., a Soviet-American war), is one of them.*" (Page 79)

Even the American imperialists in their more sober moments admit that it is not by reliance on atom bombs alone that victory can be won in the next war. The US President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training in its report (May 1947) states:

> "We must contemplate also the possibility that the final outcome will not be determined by superiority in weapons of mass destruction. To defeat

our enemy, *we may in the future, as always in the past*, have to rely on the cutting of supply lines, the systematic elimination of military objectives and, finally, the invasion and occupation of enemy territory." (Quoted by Prof. Blackett, p. 209.)

In addition, it is also important to note that the fond belief of the US monopolists that they possess the "secret" of the atom bomb is another illusion.

A year ago, on November 6, 1947, Soviet Foreign Minister, V. M. Molotov, declared that secret of the atom bomb had "long ceased to exist." And he warned:

> "It must not be forgotten that against the atomic bombs of the one side, the other side may find atomic bombs and something more, and then the final bankruptcy of all the present-day calculations of certain smug but not very intelligent people will become more than obvious."

The reality is that the imperialists in their propaganda wish to convince themselves and the forces that are opposing them that they are invincible; while, in fact, they definitely are not.

The mighty forces of the common people, resolutely combating the warmongers, resolutely defending their countries against the depredations of Wall Street and its local agents, are strong enough to defeat the instigators of a third world war.

What is necessary is to see the danger and the agents of danger clearly and uncompromisingly. What is necessary is to fight them on every front, to tear down their false masks of defenders of "Western civilisation" (so evidently in action in Malaya today), to mobilise all the rich and fertile resources of the toiling masses in the battle for the preservation of world peace.

American imperialism threatens war, foul destructive atomic war.

Sheltering behind the screen of anti-Communism, it sends its agents into every country of the world, aiming to destroy their independence, aiming to enslave their peoples, aiming to transform them into

jumping-off grounds for the planned third world war for world domination.

But these plans of the new Hitler can be defeated. One has only to remember the fear and panic with which the Hitlerites, with their widely-boosted armies and airforce, aroused throughout the world among those who have no confidence in the strength of the people. One has only to remember the cheap forecasts of speedy Soviet collapse made by people like General Marshall and Winston Churchill.

But the great Soviet Union showed no fear or panic. And it was the Red Flag that finally was hoisted over Berlin, while Hitler's hordes never saw the face of Moscow.

Such is the lesson of the second world war.

And today the forces of the people are far more powerful, while the imperialists are far weaker.

At their head stands the mighty Soviet Union, steadily advancing along the road of reconstruction and consolidation of its new Socialist order and towards the achievement of the next higher stage on humanity's onward march, Communism.

Today the Soviet Union is the most powerful State in the world. The unbreakable moral and political unity of its peoples, the mighty granite foundations of Socialist industry and agriculture on which is rising up the great fortress of Socialism, the wise, far-sighted and bold leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its trusted leader, Generalissimo Stalin—all these have made the USSR the bulwark of world progress, an invincible obstacle standing four-square in the path of all those adventurers who want to tamper with peace, all those who dream of achieving world domination through war.

Alongside the Soviet Union stand the People's Democracies of Eastern Europe, embracing a population of 80 million, who, led by the working-class parties of their countries, have destroyed the old rotten capitalist order, weeded out the agents of reaction and are going forward to build Socialism.

In the West are the mighty working-class movements of France and Italy whose power and strength

have been demonstrated in the historic and glorious struggle of the French miners and the mighty wave of strikes that rocked Italy last June when a fascist assassin attempted to murder the Communist leader of Italy's working people, Palmiro Togliatti.

Even in Bizonia (Western Germany), the heart of European reaction and the pride of Wall Street, the movement of the working class is rising; on November 12, seven million German workers took part in a twenty-four-hour general strike in the Western zone—a protest against the Marshall Plan and its effects manifested in soaring prices and impoverishment of the people.

With them is the undefeated Democratic Army of Free Greece which, under General Markos' leadership, has shown that the Greek people will never tolerate the transformation of their country into an American military base. And in the rear are the guerillas of Spain, still fighting forward against Franco's brutal regime.

In the East is the great Chinese Liberation Army, today defender of 200 million free people in China and swiftly advancing under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and the working class of China, to liberate the rest of Chinese territory. With it stand the new-born Korean People's Democratic Republic and the rising unquenchable liberation struggle of Viet Nam, Burma, Malaya and Indonesia.

Such is the mighty strength of the massed forces of the people. Such is the meaning of the proud and confident call of Otto Kuusinen, one of the foremost leaders of the world Communist movement, when he writes:

> "The anti-imperialist camp of Socialism and democracy has never been as strong as it is today. By waging war on it, the imperialists will only break their neck.
>
> Let them not forget that in the struggle of the peoples against the criminal schemes of the imperialist camp, the leading place belongs to the mightiest Power in the world, our Soviet Union, the champion of the friendship and fraternity of na-

tions. The Soviet people are the standard-bearers of progressive mankind. Those imperialists who imagine that if they force a criminal war on mankind, destiny will favour them, are insane.

We shall see whose knees will tremble when such a war imperatively faces millions of slaves of capitalism and the oppressed peoples with the decisive question: 'Are you for or against the Soviet Union?',

'Are you for or against people's democracy, for or against peace and fraternity among nations? What do you want to fight for—for a Socialist order, free of exploitation, or for the old capitalist slavery?'" (*New Times*, September 22, 1948.)

The world capitalist system is approaching its doom. Hemmed in on all sides by the powerful movements for independence and social liberation, its principal, American imperialism, dreams of saving it by resort to war. But where Hitler failed, Wall Street cannot succeed.

The first world war led to the Russian Revolution, the breaking away from the imperialist system of one-sixth of the world and the birth of the first Socialist State in history.

The second world war led to the further emancipation of the peoples of Eastern Europe, of Northern Korea, Viet Nam and new China.

The third world war, if the atom-mongers succeed in unleashing it, cannot lead to their victory—but only to their defeat, to the further and decisive breaking away of hundreds of millions from the grip of imperialism, to the shattering of the capitalist system as a world system, and to the emergence of the Socialist system as one embracing the decisive majority of the peoples of the world.

Such is the perspective—the logic and lesson of the past and the present—for the future. The American imperialists cannot turn back the wheel of history that is moving forward triumphantly to end the outworn unjust imperialist system, to end the exploitation of man by man.

But war is not inevitable. In the words of Kuusinen:

> "....We believe war can be avoided. By their activity the working people can avert war. The more resolutely the workers of all lands combat the warmongers and their accomplices, the greater are the chances that the development towards Socialism will be completed without a war." (*New Times*, September 22, 1948.)*

* Available also in booklet form: "ARE YOU FOR OR AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION?" by Otto Kuusinen, published by People's Publishing House, Ltd., Bombay 4. Price: Annas 4.

V. WHERE DOES INDIA STAND?

IN THIS TITANIC world struggle between the forces of progress and reaction, between Socialism and capitalism, where does India stand?

The present Indian Government is officially neutral. Its spokesmen take every conceivable opportunity to tell our people that they are neutral between what they falsely call the two opposing "Power blocs."

Even the official resolution passed at the Jaipur Congress declares:

> "It should be the constant aim of the foreign policy of India to maintain friendly and cooperative relations with all nations and to avoid entanglement in military or similar alliances which tend to divide up the world in rival groups and thus endanger world peace."

But how anyone can be a neutral onlooker in a fierce unrelenting world battle between Socialism and imperialism—and that too when our Premier, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, is always proclaiming his adherence to Socialism—would normally be beyond the comprehension of the common man. What kind of Socialism is this, anyone might honestly ask, which stands neutral between Socialism and the self-proclaimed enemies of Socialism?

But all this talk about neutrality is only a screen. The Indian people are bitterly suspicious of the imperialists of Britain and the USA. Hence the need to wear a mask of neutrality, behind which a policy of surrender to imperialism, of line-up behind the warmongers, can be successfully pursued.

For, in truth, such is the policy of the Nehru Government. And the events of the last few months, the last session of the UNO General Assembly and the recently concluded Commonwealth Conference show in which camp the Indian Government stands.

Of course, the gracious and elegant leader of the Indian delegation to the General Assembly tried to do some delicate verbal tight-rope walking in her speech in the general discussion at UNO in October 1948.

But despite her attempt not to commit herself to anything, she made some revealing statements.

The Congress leaders never tire of proclaiming their title to leadership of Asia's liberation struggles. Surely, the UNO General Assembly was the platform from which India's voice could have rung out denouncing the imperialist conspiracies in South-East Asia.

But listen to Mrs. Pandit on Indonesia:

> "We consider that Indonesia has reached such a stage of autonomy (the Dutch phrase for Dominion status) which entitles her to the recognition of her sovereignty. We hope soon that we may welcome Indonesia as a member of the United Nations."

Not a word in denunciation of Dutch aggression, of Dutch atrocities; no exposure of the Dutch-American conspiracy to disrupt the Republic; only verbal sympathy and that too sheltering behind the demand for "autonomy," i.e., for a compromise on Indonesia's independence—such is the character of Indian support for Indonesia's freedom struggle.

So also regarding Viet Nam, Mrs. Pandit said:

> "We hope the French Government and the people will rise to the full height of her traditional liberalism so that Viet Nam may attain self-government."

Hope—hope for self-government, is this India's only message to the brave fighters of Viet Nam? Once more no condemnation of aggression, no unmasking of the so "liberal" (!) murderers of women and children —only a "hope" and that too not for independence but

for "self-government," or in other words, slavery inside the French Union.

> "India," Mrs. Pandit also said, "has the deepest sympathy with the people of these countries (Malaya, Indonesia, Indo-China) in their struggle for freedom."

Once again no exposure of the inhuman atrocities of the British in Malaya, of the use of Gurkhas and Alsatian police-dogs, of Palestine-trained policemen and Dyak head-hunters. Only "sympathy"—and how thin this sympathy is can be seen from another part of her speech where she stated:

> "In the last twelve months she (India) has realised the danger of mass disorder and fratricidal strife and her anxiety to root them out requires no explanation. If they could be rooted out with the same speed from Palestine, Burma, Malaya and elsewhere the world would be a happier place to live in."

So here is the cat out of the bag. If only the partisan soldiers of Malaya could be liquidated by the Gurkhas (who, one can well remind Mrs. Pandit, are in Malaya with the consent of the Indian Government) as swiftly as her Government dealt with the Razakars, she would be happy.

Where is even the mask of neutrality?

In fact, despite verbal protestations of sympathy for the oppressed peoples, Mrs. Pandit was careful to avoid treading on the toes of the imperialists. And when it came to the vital issues—such as Germany, such as the atom bomb — Mrs. Pandit preserved a discreet silence or indulged in meaningless platitudes, as when, in reference to the question of control of atomic energy, she said:

> "We earnestly hope that the deliberations here will pave the way for the reconciliation of opposing views."

What is India's opinion on burning questions of international conflict and decision? According to Mrs. Pandit, we had no opinion.

This was Mrs. Pandit's contribution to the UNO discussion, a pale, colourless contribution, but one through which, at the same time, there peeped out the clear outlines of a policy that was taking India into the imperialist camp.

And this became clear when India was forced to take an open stand on the question of the control of atomic energy

When the atomic energy issue came up before the Political Committee, the Indian delegation had a golden opportunity of playing the self-adopted role of mediator. Her representative, Sir B. N. Rao, was appointed chairman of the important eleven-nation sub-committee that was to consider the resolutions on atomic energy.

Sir B. N. Rao, according to the report of *Reuter*, grasped this heaven-sent opportunity with both hands and produced an Indian draft resolution which he described as "striking a golden mean between the opposing East-West views on the subject." (*Free Press Journal*, October 19)

But, in truth, the Indian resolution covers the same ground and the same points as the final draft of the Canadian resolution (the resolution expressing the American viewpoint). Like the Canadian resolution, it also:

1) approved of the majority report of the Atomic Energy Commission as "constituting the necessary basis for establishing an effective system of international control of atomic energy."
2) instructed the Commission to resume its work and to prepare a draft treaty "incorporating the Commission's ultimate proposals."

In fact, Sir B. N. Rao admitted that there was no essential difference between the Canadian and Indian resolutions!

> "If the Canadian resolution or the Indian resolution is ultimately adopted," he declared, "the General Assembly will have approved, at least in principle, the recommendations contained in the first and second reports of the Commission, thereby strengthening the hands of the majority; giving

those recommendations the 'imprimatur' (i.e., authority—*Writer*) of the General Assembly." (*Free Press Journal*, October 19.)

Thus all talk of there having been any real difference between the two resolutions is just mere decorative verbiage. The fact is that whichever, Indian or Canadian, resolution was adopted, the UNO General Assembly would have given its full seal of approval to the American plan to create an American-controlled super-atomic trust, a spring-board for launching an atomic world war.

But despite these servile pleadings to the bosses of Wall Street, Sir B N Rao was treated by them with barely-concealed contempt. When the resolutions were finally voted upon, the Canadian resolution was adopted by the American satellite majority, the Indian resolution got one vote, that of Sir B. N. Rao!

All this shows how thin, how hypocritical is the pose of neutrality. Neutrality in words, but when it comes to action, India is to be found squarely in the imperialist camp.

The history of India's performance in UNO during the last year has been of this character When the American imperialists, in the name of UNO, knocked together a Korean "Commission," India was given the proud place of chairman; and under the aegis of this Commission, framed-up elections were held in South Korea in conditions of total fascist terror which gave birth to a South Korean Government that is a mere puppet of the USA. This Government has willingly agreed to the retention of American troops in South Korea, while, in contrast, Soviet troops have withdrawn from North Korea. Thus, the present Indian Government has contributed its share towards the betrayal of Korean freedom.

Again, when the Soviet Union recently vigorously fought inside the Trusteeship Council for the recognition of the independence of Indonesia, India's delegate, B. Shiva Rao (worthy brother of Sir B. N Rao) declared that India would remain neutral as the situation in Indonesia was "fluid"

Only lately when the Soviet Union denounced the

real inspirers of Dutch aggression in Indonesia, its Western Union partner, British imperialism, and its Marshall Plan patron, the USA, and demanded a forthright condemnation of Dutch moves, India ignored the Soviet resolution and supported the American draft, which contained only a half-hearted condemnation of the aggressor, while in practice it allowed the Dutch to proceed with their evil work.

And this is the case on every concrete issue at UNO. In international affairs, India's neutrality is only a myth, propagated by India's rulers in order to appease our anti-imperialist people who would not tolerate a total line-up with the imperialist camp.

But this identification with the imperialist cause has become more open and decisive with the participation of Pandit Nehru in the Commonwealth Premiers Conference. For at this conference, India openly ranged herself four-square with the Anglo-American instigators of war.

The communique issued at the conclusion of the conference is a cautiously-worded document. But on the principal issue of politics in Western Europe it takes a very decisive stand.

> "There was general agreement," the communique declares, "that this association of the United Kingdom with her European neighbours (through the Brussels Pact of Western Union of last March) was in accordance with the interests of the other members of the Commonwealth, the United Nations and the promotion of world peace."

Now everybody knows that the Brussels pact *is* the foundation of the Western Union, is in fact the organisation of the European satellites of the USA for an anti-Soviet war. Thus, in approving of this pact, Pandit Nehru committed the Indian Government to approval of the anti-Soviet war aims of the Anglo-American imperialists.

This is so far as Europe is concerned; what of Asia? Here the communique is silent. But from the editorial columns of the London *Times* we get an inkling of the role allotted to India and accepted by Pandit Nehru.

"All (members of the Commonwealth) alike," writes the *Times*, "are confronted with a threat of Communist pressure either on their countries or within their society The partner nations support the European Recovery Programme and believe that the real reply to Communism is not military but depends upon fortifying the social system and removing the deep-seated cause of poverty and insecurity."

Note the oblique approach to the question, the raising of the Communist bogey and the neat emphasis on "constructive work"—a concession, as it were, to Pandit Nehru who, we are told, pleaded "for constructive action towards better economic conditions in South-East Asia as a reply to Communism." (*Times of India*, October 16)

But having paid the tribute, the spokesman of imperialism shows its teeth

> "The Asiatic Dominions," it warns, "with an alien (!) insurrection raging down one side of the Indian Ocean, are under the same fire as Western Europe. Although defence by social restoration is rightly given precedence, *provision for defence by arms, if need be, has not been neglected.*"

And this is the reality of the decision of the Commonwealth Conference about Asia: fortification of the social system, i.e., defence of the capitalist order—for what else is the system today in India or Burma or Malaya, in Dutch-controlled Indonesia and French-occupied Viet Nam?—and defence of this exploiting order by "arms" against the exploited people.

But, of course, India's vested interests have joined the imperialists in their battle to suppress the rising liberation movements of South-East Asia not without a very material reason.

In commenting on this situation, Birla's paper, the *Eastern Economist*, always the most frank and shameless propagandist of the ruling class of our country, wrote on October 15:

> "Today, from an economic point of view, Malaya is in a strategic position. The dependent territo-

ries (mark the delicate description—*Writer*) belonging to the Sterling area, of which Malaya is the most important area, earning a dollar surplus in US currency.... Both as supplier of vital raw materials and as an earner of hard currency, Malaya is a source of strength to the Sterling area, *the indirect benefit of which we, too, enjoy.*" (Writer's emphasis.)

And if one adds that the capitalists of India have considerable commercial (and, in Burma, land-owning) interests throughout South-East Asia, we can well understand why Pandit Nehru and the Indian vested interests have willingly lined up with the imperialists and against the people.

This is also why the Congress resolution passed at the Jaipur Congress, despite its hypocritical chatter about neutrality, squarely places India in the war-camp when it comes to the operative part.

> "The Congress," it declares in its concluding sentence, "would welcome her (India's) free association with independent nations of the Commonwealth for their common weal and the promotion of world peace."

How has the Commonwealth suddenly come to consist of "independent nations"? What about Kenya and the Gold Coast, Malaya and Cyprus, apart from a host of other poverty-stricken red patches on the map of the world? And what about South Africa, racialist-fascist Malanazi-ridden South Africa? But these little questions are beneath the dignity of the great Premier Nehru—and so he ignores them.

Despite all the clap-trap about "independent nations of the Commonwealth," the real meaning of this resolution is that India under the Congress leaders has squarely and decisively placed herself in the camp of imperialism and war.

On this issue also it is Birla's *Eastern Economist* which speaks out the real mind of the Government. In its Annual Number (December 31, 1948) it writes:

> "....The meaning of the word 'independence' attached to our foreign policy still produces uncer-